

ajer

**THE ALBERTA JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

VOLUME XLIII

NUMBER 1

SPRING 1997

The Alberta Journal of Educational Research

Published in Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter by the Faculty of Education,
University of Alberta.

ajer is a quarterly journal devoted to the dissemination, criticism,
interpretation, and encouragement of all forms of systematic enquiry into
education and fields related to or associated with education.

Editor: Beth Young
Administrator: Joyce Hiller

Technical Editor: Naomi Stinson
Proofreader: Karen McFarlane
Translator: Ronald N. Boivin

Consulting Editors

George Buck
University of Alberta
Ardra L. Cole
*Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education*
Sharon M. Haggerty
University of Western Ontario
Susan Hill
University of South Australia
Dianne Looker
Acadia University

Flora Ida Ortiz
University of California, Riverside
Hans Smits
University of Regina
Kelleen Toohey
Simon Fraser University
Robert Wilson
Queen's University
Dean Wood
Keyano College
Jon C. Young
University of Manitoba

ajer gratefully acknowledges support from the Social Sciences and
Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Alberta Advisory Committee
for Educational Studies, and the Research Grants Office of the University of
Alberta

The subscription rate is \$37.00 per year for individuals, \$45.00 per year for
institutions. Add \$8.00 for delivery outside Canada. Single copies are \$12.00
each. Subscriptions and sales in Canada will be charged 7% GST. Please make
cheques payable to *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. Back issues are
available; rates supplied on request. Claims for undelivered copies must be
received within three months of publication. Please refer to order form at the
end of each issue.

Address all communications and manuscript submissions to:

The Alberta Journal of Educational Research
Office of the Dean
845 Education Centre South
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, Canada, T6G 2G5.
Fax: (403) 492-0236

Publications Mail Registration Number 1436



The Alberta Journal of Educational Research

Volume XLIII, Number 1, Spring 1997

Beth Young **1** From the Editor's Desk

Articles

Allison Tom **3** The Deliberate Relationship: A Frame for
Talking About Faculty-Student
Relationships

Anne E. Elliott **23** Some Female Professors' Experiences of
Vera E. Woloshyn Collaboration: Mapping the Collaborative
Process Through Rough Terrain

Y.L. Jack Lam **37** Loose-Coupled Responses to External
Constraints: An Analysis of Public
Educators' Coping Strategies

Research Notes **51** Editor's Note

Julia Ellis **53** Volunteer Mentorship Programs to Prevent
and Respond to Troubled Behavior

Marina Vanayan **57** Would You Like to Be a Peer Mediator?
Nicholas White Willingness to Be a Peer Mediator Among
Patricia Yuen Elementary Students: Effects of Grade
Marla Teper and Gender

Book Reviews

John A. Ross **61** *Assessing Students in Classrooms and Schools*
by Robert J. Wilson

Don Chapman **64** *The Changing University?* edited by Tom
Schuller

Single copies of this issue are available for purchase.
Please see order form at end of issue.

[HTTP://WWW.EDUCATION.UALBERTA.CA/EDUC/JOURNALS/AJER:HTML](http://WWW.EDUCATION.UALBERTA.CA/EDUC/JOURNALS/AJER:HTML)

ISSN 0002-4805

Guest Editors, 1996

Jane Gaskell
David MacKinnon

Raj Pannu
Swee Hin Toh

Reviewers, 1996

Akankwasa, R.	Hess, G.	Olson, M.
Bailey, B.	Hill, S.	Orr, J.
Bateson, D.J.	Hollaar, L.	Ortiz, F.
Beazley, R.	Holmes, J.	Rees, R.
Borys, A.	Iveson, M.	Riffel, T.
Bosetti, L.	Kachur, J.	Robertson, H-J.
Buck, G.	Kozey, L.	Ryan, J.
Cameron, J.	LaRocque, L.	Sanaoui, R.
Cawagas, V.F.	Larson, B.	Singh, J.
Cole, A.	Levin, B.	Sheppard, B.
Collins, A.	Livingstone, D.	Shulha, L.
Collins, C.	MacInnis, C.	Smits, H.
Corbeil, G.	MacKinnon, A.	Snart, F.
De Pass, C.	MacKinnon, D.	Symons, S.
Doherty-Poirier, M.A.	MacPherson, RJS	Tardif, C.
Drodge, E.	Maguire, T.	Taylor, G.
Egnatoff, W.	Manicom, A.	Varnhagen, C.K.
Ellis, J.	Marisi, P.	Waugh, E.
Fasano, J.	Matriano, E.	Weber, S.
Freeze, D.R.	Mawhinney, H.	Welch, T.
Gaskell, J.	Maynes, B.	Wideen, M.
Gillespie, R.	McDonald, L.	Wilson, A.
Haggerty, S.	Mitchell, C.	Wilson, R.
Haughey, M.	Neilsen, A.	Zuber, R.

For Contributors

Submission of a manuscript to **ajer** implies, and is an undertaking on the part of the author(s), that neither the manuscript nor any substantially similar manuscript has been published, is in press, or is under consideration elsewhere. This is a condition for publication in **ajer**.

Guidelines

Format	Submit the manuscript in triplicate. Manuscripts are not to exceed 6,500 words excluding graphics. Use standard type and double-space throughout, including block quotations, references, and notes. To ensure anonymity in the review process, the author's name and affiliation appear only on the title page; the title alone heads the first page of the manuscript. Provide an abstract of approximately 100 words on a separate sheet.
Style	ajer's editorial style conforms closely to the <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association</i> (4th ed.). Editorial changes may be made to manuscripts. For spelling, consult <i>Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary</i>; spelling in quoted material remains as in the original.
Referencing	Sources cited appear in parentheses after each reference (direct or otherwise), giving author's name (unless mentioned in text), year of publication, and page number(s) in the case of direct quotes. Enclose quotes of 40 or fewer words in double quotation marks in the text; indent quotes longer than 40 words in block format. Page numbers must be given. List all sources alphabetically at the end of the manuscript under the heading <i>References</i> using the APA style. Footnotes are not allowed, and the use of endnotes is discouraged; however, <i>necessary</i> brief explanatory notes, numbered consecutively and marked in the text with superscript numerals, may appear before the References under the heading <i>Notes</i>; citations in notes follow the same format as other references.
Graphics	Number tables and figures with Arabic numerals and provide each on a separate page at the end of the manuscript. Prepare tables using tabs and without vertical lines; provide figures, charts, and diagrams in camera-ready form. Indicate placement of figures and tables in text, i.e., <i>Insert Table 3 here</i>.
Diskettes	If the manuscript is accepted for publication, please supply in electronic form on a diskette. WordPerfect for PC and Microsoft Word for Macintosh are the preferred software. Mark diskette with originator's name and program used.
Research Notes	Research Notes are brief notes on research-in-progress or recently completed research, 1,000 words excluding graphics and references. Provide e-mail address, fax, and/or telephone number. Detailed guidelines are given at the beginning of the <i>Notes</i> section.

AJER is indexed in the *Alberta Education Index*, *Canadian Education Index*, *Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *ERIC/Current Index to Journals in Education*, and *Social Science Citation Index*; appropriate articles are abstracted in *Cognitive Development Abstracts*, *Educational Administration Abstracts*, *Educational Technology Abstracts*, *Family Abstracts*, *Language Behavior Abstracts*, *Multicultural Education Abstracts*, *Psychological Abstracts*, *Research into Higher Education Abstracts*, *School Organization and Management Abstracts*, and *Sociology of Education Abstracts*, and reviewed by the *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

https://archive.org/details/ajer_1997

From the Editor's Desk

Change and Continuity

This issue begins the second volume of the *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* (**ajer**) for which I have had editorial responsibility. I am indeed a little older, wiser, and wearier than I was when I wrote my first editorial note, which appeared last March. But I am no less fascinated by the challenge of producing a quality eclectic journal of systematic, scholarly enquiry into education. Many individuals have helped me in various ways to address this challenge. I want to acknowledge a number of them in this note and also to outline some changes we are making at **ajer** as part of living in a '90s world.

The good-natured assistance of numerous people has sustained me in my own editorial efforts and continues to do so. Among those people are the colleagues who have reviewed manuscripts for **ajer** in the past year, as well as the four guest editors who were responsible between them for the two significant theme issues that were published under **ajer's** banner in 1996. Those who have been asked to participate in the peer review process have almost always responded in a thoughtful, thorough, and punctual fashion (even in the face of escalating demands on their time). The names of these colleagues are listed following the Contents page.

Over the past year **ajer's** consulting editors have fulfilled a dual and sometimes demanding role. They have acted as reviewers themselves and have also suggested potentially appropriate reviewers to me on the basis of the abstracts that I have circulated by e-mail. In both roles their responses have been rapid and helpful, greatly expanding the scope of the expertise that is available to me. This network of consulting editors has provided me with up-to-date contacts across the academic community during a time of considerable staff turnover in our Canadian universities. In future they will also encourage the submission of manuscripts and research notes to **ajer**.

A number of consulting editors have retired in recent months, and I want to thank them all for their contributions to the work of **ajer**, particularly Ruth Rees for her consistently obliging and supportive presence. I am also pleased to welcome several new consulting editors whose names appear, together with those of the continuing editors, on the masthead of this issue. We are intentionally a diverse group in terms of our locations—intellectual, geographic, and organizational. I very much appreciate our congenial and collegial relations as we work together on **ajer**.

In addition to those whose names appeared on **ajer's** masthead in 1996, there are several people in the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta whose names have not appeared anywhere, but whose presence has provided me with invaluable technical assistance of one sort or another. In the Dean's office they are Joyce Hiller, Edie Peters, and Fran Harder. In the Division of Technology they are Gerry Kendal, Bob Bolt, and Richard Makowski. Helping me manage the paper in my own office is Anna Gibson. And, always available

to provide moral support and helpful advice, is Tom Kieren, Associate Dean of Research.

Last year I introduced a *Research Notes* section. I have since expanded my initial guidelines for such Notes to include reports on smaller research projects that have one or two findings of particular interest but do not warrant full-article treatment (please see the current guidelines at the beginning of the *Notes* section). This expansion is consistent with my goal of providing an informal channel of communication among researchers. Some research notes appear by my express invitation, and some have been submitted in response to my general invitation. I encourage more active use of the *Research Notes* option!

This year, on a trial basis, we will publish one combined issue. As you may already have noticed, we are now designating the issues by season rather than by month, beginning with this first Spring issue. The next issue will combine Summer and Fall and will be followed by a shorter Winter issue late in 1997. The reason for this is the changing context in which many Canadian universities—and certainly our own Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta—are functioning. Severe financial cutbacks together with the accompanying reductions in academic and nonacademic staff mean increased pressures on those of us who remain. Increased overall workloads appear to be reducing the “discretionary” time that is available for writing and editorial tasks, and this has multiple effects on the production of a scholarly journal such as **ajer**.

Rather than according these realities a doing-more-with-less gloss, I am choosing a doing-better-but-less editorial stance. I have therefore proposed that we adjust the frequency of publication for our 1997 volume and, depending on the number and quality of submissions, the number of articles that we publish. This will permit all involved to do their part at a more measured pace, in keeping with the other pressures in our lives. This includes reducing the pressures on me, as **ajer**’s editor, to “publish or perish” according to the exigencies of a quarterly publication schedule. Instead, I will devote more of my available time to recruiting and assisting contributors in the development of a wide range of interesting manuscripts. Send them to me!

Beth Young
beth.young@ualberta.ca

PS: **ajer**’s website is updated and running at <http://www.education.ualberta.ca/educ/journals/ajer.html>. Check it out for volume indexes, recent Contents, current Guidelines for Contributors, and an **ajer** order form.

Allison Tom

University of British Columbia

The Deliberate Relationship: A Frame for Talking About Faculty-Student Relationships

Increasing attention to sexual harassment has raised awareness of other abuses of the power imbalance between university faculty and students, which now raises the exciting task of creating frames for relationships between faculty and students that respect real and continuing power differences without exaggerating or entrenching them. Contemporary responses to this power differential are characterized as positions of either distance or denial; neither of these positions satisfactorily addresses the demands of creating a dynamic, respectful, and mutually rewarding relationship. Drawing on experiences in research, mothering, and teaching, and on literature in feminist ethnography and psychology, this article proposes the deliberate relationship as a frame that can help faculty consciously and purposefully carry out their roles. Six elements of the deliberate relationship are suggested: acknowledgment of the rewards of teaching; awareness of power; maintenance of limits; recognition of the dynamic nature of power relationships; transparency of practice; and personal presence.

L'attention croissante à l'harcèlement sexuel a permis une prise de conscience plus aigüe des autres problèmes d'abus dûs au déséquilibre de pouvoir entre le corps professoral universitaire et les étudiants et les étudiantes universitaires. Ceci pose un défi intéressant à relever au développement de bornes quant aux relations entre le corps professoral et les étudiant(e)s qui respectent les inégalités de pouvoir sans les exagérer ni les retrancher davantage. Les réponses contemporaines à ces inégalités de pouvoir sont caractérisées en terme de distance ou de reniement; aucune de ces positions n'adresse de façon satisfaisante les demandes de la création d'une relation dynamique, respectueuse, et mutuellement enrichissante. En s'inspirant des expériences en recherche, en maternage, en enseignement, et en littérature de l'ethnographie et de la psychologie féministe, cet article propose la relation délibérée comme cadre qui aiderait les membres de la faculté à se comporter intentionnellement selon certains rôles. On propose la présence de six éléments de la relation délibérée, soit: la reconnaissance et la récompense inerte à l'enseignement; d'être conscient(e) du pouvoir; de maintenir les limites; de reconnaître de la nature dynamique des relations où figurent le pouvoir, la pratique transparente, et la présence personnelle.

As a feminist I struggle to create relationships in my personal and professional life that express and embody my convictions. Like others I find this particularly challenging where I have power over others. Like others I have searched for ways to articulate and meet my responsibilities. One of the places this struggle has been most visible to me has been in teaching, both in the classroom and in graduate student supervision. My purpose here is to explore some aspects of the relations between college and university faculty and students in terms of what I have come to call the *frame of the deliberate relationship*. I hope to share how thinking from the frame of the deliberate relationship has helped me

Allison Tom is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Studies. Her primary research interests are in developing innovative ethnographic research approaches suitable to the study of feminist concerns and the study of the relationships between women's paid and unpaid work and education. Her current research focuses on the meanings of work and mothering for child care workers in British Columbia.

acknowledge the responsibilities of being in a position of authority in relation to students while working with them to challenge, question, and redistribute power to the fullest extent possible.

Feminism, postmodernism, and challenges from many marginalized groups have changed our understandings of the power inherent in the faculty-student relationship. These forces have been at the heart of challenges to unethical uses of power in the university, among them the sexual exploitation of students (MacKinnon, 1979; Rich, 1985). Scrutiny of the unethical use of the power imbalance between faculty and students, however, must not stop at denouncing sexual exploitation. The relationship of teaching demands an articulate frame that helps us¹ carry our responsibilities consciously and faithfully without further entrenching the privilege of our positions. As many feminist teachers (Culley & Diamond, 1985; Friedman, 1985; Gardner, Dean, & McKaig, 1989; Manicom, 1992) and others have discovered, rejecting or ignoring the authority and power of the role of teacher is an inadequate response. The institutions in which we work and the genuine requirements of the work we do make it impossible to disavow our responsibility. We are called upon not to reject our authority and power, but to use them carefully and to acknowledge, jointly with those to whom we are responsible, the responsibilities of power and to challenge hoarding and misuse of power (Currie, 1992; hooks, 1988).

In the first section of this article I review my experience in seemingly disparate roles and with theories from different areas of (mostly feminist) thought and discuss their contribution to my emerging notion of the deliberate relationship. In the second section I appraise the arguments supporting and disputing the assertion that the faculty-student relationship is one that demands the kinds of ethical standards I propose. In the third section I discuss frames now in use for handling ethically the relationships of unequal power—what I call the frames of distance and denial—and critique them in terms of their ability to support the goal of simultaneously respecting and deconstructing power relationships. In the fourth and largest section I propose and describe the fundamental elements of the deliberate relationship as I understand it so far.

A Framework Built on Living in Roles and Reading in Books

I am an ethnographer, a mother, and a teacher. I live in other roles as well—those of partner, patient, colleague, and friend, for example—but the first three most compellingly capture my attention and challenge me to expand my understanding of the demands of ethical practice because these are relationships in which I clearly have power over and in the lives of others. I first began to build the notion of the deliberate relationship in my practice as an ethnographer. The question that nagged me then—and that still nags me now—is how to enter ethically into a relationship with someone else when my reasons for wanting the relationship are deliberate and very different from theirs. I want “good data” for my research. Friendly relationships with research participants enhance my data. Research participants want something else; they may want friendship, championship, or a sympathetic listener. They may hope to benefit from my connections. Because I have initiated the relationship, they may not be as clear about what they want as I am about what I want. Hence a relationship

I enter into pragmatically and instrumentally (even if with blameless goals for social improvement) may feel like work to me and friendship to a participant.

Researchers' conflicts in the ethnographic relationship arise not simply because they enter into pragmatic relationships that "feel like friendship" to participants. The conflict is more profound; power imbalances are inherent in the research relationship. The position of observing, recording, and commenting is a position of power. Further, ethnographers usually come from more powerful social places than the people they study, and the results of their work represent participants in ways participants cannot control. As an ethnographer I am challenged to construct research relationships that honor the personhood of the people I study and that enhance rather than diminish their welfare. This means creating more open relationships than ethnographers have done in the past; it often means seeking ways to collaborate with participants rather than simply studying them (Tom, 1996).

I have been an ethnographer longer than I have been a mother, but I know that the struggles of mothering and ethnography have much in common. When I converse with myself about how I relate to my children, the conversation repeats many of the refrains familiar from my conversations about ethnography. How, for example, shall I relate to my children so that they can come to know themselves as powerful and responsible actors in the world? How shall I carry the responsibility of the emotional, social, and intellectual power I hold over them? My connection to my children is deep and visceral; no research participant, no matter how dear, will pull me the way my children do. My power over my children is also more absolute and, appallingly, subject to less social control. Nonetheless, I recognize in both relationships the responsibility to make deliberate choices about my behavior and my long-term goals for the relationship.

In teaching, my responsibilities and goals are likewise deliberately set and must be deliberately pursued. As a teacher primarily of mature graduate students, there are many temptations to persuade myself that the formalities of the teacher-student relationship can be abandoned. But the requirements of the teaching relationship are not determined primarily by the relative ages of teacher and student, nor by the relative external social power of teacher and student. The primary obligations of the teaching relationship are determined by the task of teaching, of taking responsibility for nurturing another's intellectual growth, and in the case of feminist teaching, the task of analyzing and challenging relations of domination (Manicom, 1992). Like research and mothering, teaching demands that one person expose vulnerable parts of himself or herself to another. Students of every age and social status have the right to be vulnerable before their teachers and to come with questions, uncertainty, and developing ideas. Students have the right to expect that the power their vulnerability gives their teachers will be used on their behalf.

When I am an ethnographer, a mother, or a teacher, I am thus always bound by the obligation to construct my practice out of concern for someone else. In these relationships I am not allowed to respond out of my desire to meet my immediate personal needs—whether they are sexual, emotional, professional, or intellectual. I am bound to respond out of awareness of and commitment to

my responsibility to further and protect the welfare and development *within a defined scope* of another person, group, or goal.

The search for a theory of relationships that simultaneously supports empowering practice (Surrey, 1991a) and protects those to whom we are responsible is not limited to one field. Postmodernists and feminists have explored how what we do has an impact on those to whom we are directly responsible and often on people beyond this immediate circle (Alcoff, 1991; Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991; Lather, 1991). Other responses have come from the widely varied literature on sexual harassment and sexual exploitation (Paludi et al., 1990; Rutter, 1989). In my formulation of the deliberate relationship, I seek to add insights from discussions of power, authority, and privilege in feminist research and discussions of feminist psychotherapy to the conversation about feminist pedagogy. My argument is not that these relationships are identical, but that they are similar enough that important learning may be transferred from one kind of relationship to the other.

Contemporary, particularly postmodern, ethnographers wrestle with the ethical and interpersonal uneasiness of the ethnographic relationship's necessary duplicity. For example, Lederman (1990) comments that being in "the field" is not being in a different place, but "placing oneself *deliberately* in a context of commitment doubly different from the normal one." Being in the field requires "a shifting of attention and of sociable connection." Hence the field is a "particular relation between oneself and others, involving a difficult combination of commitment and disengagement, relationship and separation" (p. 88, emphasis added). The postmodern concern with how research relationships construct the other as *other* is also this struggle to find relationships that honor the personhood and autonomy of research participants. Ethnographers and other researchers who construct personal relationships for research purposes are questioning and carefully describing the limits and conflicts of these relationships (Fine, 1994; Lather, 1991; Marcus, 1994; Oakley, 1981; Patai, 1991; Stacey, 1991).

New developments in feminist psychology and psychotherapy also emphasize the importance of relationship, connection, and shared power. This work is exemplified by both the work of scholars at the Stone Center (Jordan et al., 1991) and that of Gilligan and her colleagues at Harvard University (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990). These theorists emphasize how women's strengths are ignored and devalued when separation, independence, and one-way giving in relationships are emphasized.² Caring, learning, and being in relationships are not, in their view, most effective when they are one-way enterprises, but when they are those of mutual growth and enhancement. As Miller (1991a) says of a young girl's developing sense of self in relationship to her mother, "the point is that she is attuned to the feelings of the other person, and just as her feelings are influenced by the other's feelings, so too, do they influence the other's feelings" (p. 17). In these views, therapeutic (or other learning) relationships are stronger when they are *mutually* engaging and rewarding and when power is redefined as mutual empowerment or power with rather than power over (Miller, 1991b; Surrey, 1991b).

The Obligations of the Faculty-Student Relationship

Currently the obligations of the faculty-student relationship are most commonly presented in discussions or debates about sexual relationships between faculty and students. Awareness of the incidence of overt sexual *harassment* from faculty to students has grown in recent years and specific policies prohibiting sexual harassment in universities and colleges are now common. New university and college codes of ethics now clearly articulate that it is unacceptable for faculty members to use their power to coerce students into sexual relationships (Hoffman, 1986; MacKinnon, 1979; Paludi et al., 1990; Rutter, 1989; Tuana, 1985). There is a widespread lack of clarity, however, about the line between harassing and nonharassing sexual relationships and about the damage of so-called consensual sexual relationships between faculty and students. There seems to be general agreement that harassment is bad but confusion about whether or not “consensual” sexual relationships between faculty and students are harmful (DeChiara, 1988; Hitt, Blythe, Boswell, Botstein, & Kerrigan, 1993; Keller, 1990; Ricker, 1993; Stern, 1993; Wagner, 1993).

At issue is the question of whether—and to what degree—faculty have power over students. The more powerful students are in the world—whether because of their age, gender, or social status—the more difficult it may be to maintain clarity about the demands of the faculty-student relationship. There is disagreement about whether consensual relationships between *all* faculty and *all* students, whether or not they are directly working together, are necessarily unethical and damaging to students. There is now, however, general agreement, in theory and practice, that if a faculty member has current or potential power to affect the student’s academic career, truly consensual relationships are difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Because of the power inherent in the faculty-student relationship, whenever faculty and students occupy those roles in relationship to each other, sexual relationships have an inescapable element of coercion and inequality. Tuana (1985) argues that the power dynamics between faculty and students mean that instructors should know better than to convince themselves they can “make a sexual advance to a student in their class or a student about whom they are making academic decisions which would indeed be perceived by the student as being sanction-free” (p. 60). Rich (1985) argues that women faced with seductive gestures by men who carry the university’s power “experience a profound mixture of humiliation and intellectual self-doubt.” The overture itself is harmful: “Even if turned aside, such gestures constitute mental rape, destructive to a woman’s ego” (p. 26).

The literature on sexual harassment makes the power differential between faculty and students clear. Careful reading of these arguments also makes it clear that sexual exploitation of students by faculty is the most extreme and visible form—not the only form—of exploitation. When sexual harassment is challenged in the university or college environment, other forms of exploitation of the power imbalance are also gradually revealed and contested. Thus a challenge to sexual harassment logically leads to a challenge to other forms of exploitation of the power imbalance in the faculty-student relationship. Hoffman (1986), for example, argues that policies aimed at preventing sexual harassment “should have at their core a vision of human relationships built on

trust, equality, and mutual respect" (p. 114). She goes on to say that institutions should concern themselves more with finding ways of building relationships of mutual trust and equity than with prohibiting abuses of institutionalized inequality. In her mind it is both more challenging and more rewarding to sort through such difficult and complicated issues "than to promulgate policies which reinforce status hierarchies" (p. 114).

Concerns such as Hoffman's need not be limited to sexual relationships with students; we do not have to be sexual with students to exploit them. The goal is to create working and learning environments where the necessary inequalities of the teaching relationship are handled with care and respect. Intimate emotional relationships—of "friendship," for example—can be emotionally exploitive and interfere with students' academic growth, self-confidence, reputation with peers, and achievement in much the same way as sexual relationships. The constraints that limit students' ability to resist sexual relationships with faculty similarly limit their ability to resist emotional relationships. The circumstances that make it harmful for a faculty member to offer a sexual relationship also make the offer of friendship harmful. Relationships of power imbalance demand that we respond with a clearly and carefully defined ethic.

Responses to Power Imbalance: Current Models of Ethical Faculty-Student Relationships

Two kinds of responses to relationships of power imbalance are common. The first is most clearly represented by professional codes of ethics; these are rules that help people in positions of power manage their power "in trust" for those in their care. I call this the response of distance. Another response to the power imbalance frequently arises out of radical critiques of authority in the classroom (Friedman 1985). In this response teachers are encouraged to minimize power differentials between themselves and their students and to emphasize commonality and friendship with students in an attempt to equalize or disavow power imbalances. I call this the response of denial. The feminist critique of these positions—especially in recent years of the limitations to the disavowal of power—have contributed to the continuing development of theories of feminist pedagogy. The pictures of the relationships that follow are necessarily generalities; my intent is not so much to portray every detail of these relationships accurately as it is to talk about their overall impact and characteristics. Furthermore, although I have separated them for the purpose of discussion, they are not necessarily separate: they can be intertwined in practice.

The Response of Distance

The response of distance tends to be the traditional response of the professions and is often formally embodied in professional codes of ethics. Institutional or professional codes, as Hoffman (1986) points out, reduce phenomena to their "behavioral manifestations and to bureaucratic grievance procedures" (p. 117). These preventive measures do not address the broader inequalities in the institution that support abuses of power. Such rules assert that "safety" lies in the public and formal discharge of roles, whereas "danger" lies in the personal and private discharge of these roles. These rules bind those in subordinate

positions to the organization, for it is only within the organization that redress for abuse can be sought.

Such a frame necessarily reduces both faculty member and student to cardboard caricatures attempting to create a relationship. Neither can safely move out of the prescribed roles and risk genuine connection or any sort of deviation from these roles. As Hoffman (1986) warns, subordinate positions are *reinforced* through the ostensible protection for individuals in those positions. Nonetheless, there are some advantages to these formal codes; they acknowledge the power imbalance by naming it. In this way they may sometimes support challenge. That is, a person responding to the power of her or his role from the position of distance acknowledges the power of that role; when professional or institutional codes are invoked, power is overt, not masked. Subordinates thus may be able to name the power imbalance and challenge its abuse.

Exploitation can occur within the frame of distance; when it does, it most often takes the form of *inappropriately using* rather than *denying* the power. For example, in a recent, hotly debated issue of *Harper's* magazine, Yale Professor William Kerrigan maintained that a sexual relationship between himself and some students was in their interest. He said that, for example, a student "who, for one reason or another, has unnaturally prolonged her virginity" could be helped by a professor (such as himself) who recognizes the "preciousness" of that virginity because "if she loses that virginity with a man who is not a teacher, she's going to marry that man, boom. And I don't think the marriage is going to be very good" (Hitt et al., 1993, pp. 35-36). Kerrigan is not denying his power over students; rather, he is proposing to use it in a particular way.

The response of distance is essentially an untrusting one; it guards students against faculty members' abuse of power by keeping faculty and students at an exaggerated, and not necessarily healthy, distance from each other. The distant relationship does not prepare students to defend themselves if faculty choose to abuse their power. As Hoffman (1986) points out, it forces students to turn to the university to intervene on their behalf. More disconcerting, distance does not build or support a relationship that critiques or dismantles power. It does not support students' (or others') gradual and appropriate increase in power, and it does not support conversations about the distribution of power. No doubt it is important to ensure that those in positions of power are trustworthy. More important, though, a genuinely empowering frame of relationship would support critiques of the use of power and the ways privilege and genuine power can be confused. It would also support the growth and development of those in subordinate positions in ways that increase their ability to name and challenge abuses of power themselves.

Furthermore, the response of distance increases the privilege associated with the teacher's role through the creation of a kind of mystique. The rules of distance become a cloak behind which teachers can hide their humanity and vulnerability. As in *The Wizard of Oz*, the response of distance exaggerates both the grandeur of the one in charge and the puniness of the subordinate one. It eliminates the possibility of genuine relationship. Miller and Stiver (1991), feminist psychotherapists, assert that the past rules of distance in therapy "serve very much to protect the therapist" (p. 12). Stiver elaborates elsewhere

(1991): “the typical standards of ‘care’ ... which often support explicitly and implicitly the need for barriers ... may function to contain the anxiety of the treaters more than the treated” (p. 253). Thus the benefit of the response of distance is that power is acknowledged and is usually visible; its disadvantage is that it increases the privilege associated with powerful positions and does not adequately support students’ efforts to grow, to demand change in teaching relationships, and to protect themselves.

The Response of Denial

A common response to the way the position of distance enhances and mystifies the privileges of power is to attempt to deny the power of the position one holds. Friedman (1985) makes clear how radical theories of pedagogy—and their attempts to disavow power in the classroom—are “a critique of *male* authority as it manifested itself in the classroom” (p. 207, emphasis in the original). Although feminists are not the only teachers to discover how problematic attempts to disavow power are, they have been more forthcoming than others in their reflections on the limitations of this response and their search for new responses. In this section I review what I see as two factors that make disavowal of power so attractive to progressive teachers, and then review critiques of such attempts that have emerged in feminist and other literatures.

The urge to deny one’s power as a teacher is rooted in a complex history of the problematization of power itself (Culley & Diamond, 1985; Manicom, 1992). Thus a first motivation for the response of denial often comes from a fundamental misnaming of the problem; power itself—rather than the abuse of power or the use of power as *power over* rather than *power with*—is rejected (Miller, 1991b). Gardner’s (Gardner et al., 1989) description of her initial understanding of the “truly feminist classroom” illuminates how the position of denial may initially appeal to feminists who want to address the imbalance of power in the classroom. In such a classroom, she believed that she would “give up my official trappings, merge with the class, and, in the classic sense of ‘instructor,’ become invisible” (p. 65). She critiques this early response as being excessively passive. It did not give her the authority to intervene in classroom dynamics and thus it did not give her the power to really teach.

Second, in my experience those who deny the power of the teacher’s role are often deeply, and justifiably, offended at the way the vulnerability of the student role can be used to deny students’ other real strengths as learners and people in the world. Such well-intentioned individuals may seek to redress this imbalance by emphasizing their students’ expertise in the world and their maturity; thus these arguments may become increasingly common as students move through their undergraduate and graduate educations. These arguments of students’ status in the world beyond the academy may encourage teachers to obscure or deny students’ vulnerability in the teaching relationship.

As teachers have acted on these assumptions in the classroom, they have realized that attempts to deny power in situations and institutions where power is unequally distributed leads to its own set of contradictions and complications, three of which I explore here. First, teachers have come to realize that the power we have by virtue of our particular expertise and our institutional roles is something we must own and use with responsibility rather than

disavow. As Gardner's critique illustrates (Gardner et al., 1989), if we are to truly teach we must acknowledge and use the power of our position. As hooks (1988) explains, we must acknowledge the power inherent in the role of teacher. "We can use that power in ways that diminish or in ways that enrich and it is this choice that should distinguish feminist pedagogy from ways of teaching that reinforce domination" (p. 52).

Other scholars have extended this notion in discussions of the importance of interruption to successful feminist and antiracist teaching. Interrupting requires that the teacher exercise her or his power to draw students' attention to ways that their interactions repeat and reinforce relations of oppression (Currie, 1992). A teacher who has positioned herself or himself as equal or without power in the classroom has surrendered the ability to intervene. Others warn that women, especially women of color, can sometimes ill afford to further their students' already entrenched tendencies to view them as powerless because of their gender, ethnicity, first language, or country of origin (Hoodfar, 1992; Karamcheti, 1995). Thus disavowing our power may unwittingly entrench rather than challenge relations of oppression.

Second, disavowal of power in relationships with students attempts to substitute a frame of "friendship" or equality for the relationship of teaching. Such attempts involve students in what Murray, Gillese, Lennon, Mercer, and Robinson (1996) call "dual relationships ... that are likely to detract from student development or lead to actual or perceived favoritism on the part of the teacher" (unpaginated). To imagine that denying power or inequality adequately protects students from exploitation is to indulge in a particularly invidious kind of self-deception. Students who want to participate in a relationship with a teacher who uses the frame of denial must agree not to notice, or not to mention, the power difference between them and their teacher. The type of exploitation that occurs in such "friendships" is usually a meeting of the teacher's needs through denial that they are met at the expense of the student. The teacher's needs are superimposed on the student's needs and obliterate them. The absence of visible differences between the teacher's and the student's needs is then read as evidence that they are the same. For example, sexual abuse of students in this frame comes from a conviction that the relationship is mutual. With the power differential invisible, students' inability to refuse sexual advances without penalty is invisible as well.

Thus the response of denial puts students at particular risk of emotional abuse. The power dynamic that makes it difficult for them to resist sexual advances is equally relevant when friendship is offered. Students may be recruited to "help" their teachers with their professional lives or may be asked to become inappropriately involved in their teachers' emotional lives. Such requests are breaches of trust because students cannot be sure they can refuse without penalty. They are also breaches because they break the fundamental obligation of the teaching relationship: that the students' welfare should come first.

Third, denying the position of power is an attempt to erase the differences of the powerful-subordinate relationship by the force of individual will; those who wish that power differentials did not exist attempt to erase them in their personal lives and interactions. We cannot relinquish our power in existing

educational institutions and relationships. Thus attempts to disavow our authority are confusing and inauthentic. Gagne (1992) argues that the ideology and practice of sharing power with students can reinforce power relations between students and teachers. "The ideology of sharing power can conceal the final authority of the teacher: to discipline, to grade, to select the curriculum." Thus teachers who believe that sharing power is easily done confuse their students; "the offer of shared power competing with the reality of the teachers' power and with students' differential access to power" (p. 60). Because we live and work in systems and relationships that put us in positions of power, we cannot disavow our power. Hill (1990) talks about how confusing it is for students when "espoused theories" and "theories in use" conflict. "Negating an authority does not remove one from the system in which it is found ... and does not contribute toward changing the system in which there are those at the center and those at the margins of power" (p. 77).

The response of distance and the response of denial both silence challenges to the abuse of power, fail to support students' changing and increasing power in the relationship, and reinforce both power and privilege in relationships of inequality. The distant response may silence challenge through direct threat. It makes the processes of power something that the student is not *and never will be* qualified to discuss or understand. It fails to treat students as individuals whose power in the relationship will gradually increase and change. The response of denial silences challenge to inequalities by denying that inequality is there. It requires that students participate in an unspoken lie that makes the practice of power covert and, consequently, slippery to fight.

The Deliberate Relationship

The two most common responses to the power of the teacher role thus fail to provide what an empowering teaching relationship demands. I turn now to the frame of the deliberate relationship I have been developing—in my practices as a researcher, mother, and teacher—and apply it to the requirements of the teaching relationship. Although the teacher-student relationship is sometimes spoken of as a contractual relationship parallel to other fee-for-service relationships, I prefer the word *deliberate*. This emphasizes the greater responsibilities of deliberate relationships and the consequent responsibility for thoughtful, reflective practice. In the deliberate relationship, there is a pause between the experience of an impulse and its expression. In that pause, however brief, we interrogate the impulse: Does it serve the long-term obligations of the relationship? If the answer is No, we refrain. In this way, the thoughts and feelings expressed in the deliberate relationship are both genuine and controlled. Learning to be deliberate in relationship requires learning to pause, to ask, and then to act responsibly.

When I engage in, or refrain from engaging in, certain behaviors as a researcher, as a mother, or as a teacher, I am doing my part in thoughtfully and deliberately *creating a relationship*. As an ethnographer I am creating a relationship in which I can ethically collect data; as a mother I am creating a relationship in which my children can grow and come to know themselves as efficacious actors in the world. As a teacher I am creating a relationship in which students can learn. Thus my actions as a teacher are done *on purpose* and

for a purpose. The deliberate relationship is a consequence of my awareness of acting in the relationship for a specific purpose.

A deliberate practice of teaching requires self-awareness of what is increasingly being called our *positionality*. It also requires conscious work to develop theories about the power dynamic of the teaching relationship and a willingness to use power in the interest of students and of our teaching goals. Not surprisingly, it is expressed and supported by some teaching techniques adopted by feminist teachers.

In this final section I discuss position in terms of awareness about the rewards of teaching and about the power of the teaching relationship. Two important theoretical positions on power are presented. First, that it is necessary to use power, but only within appropriate limits; and, second, that power dynamics change over time. Finally, I discuss two techniques that often serve me well in pursuit of the deliberate relationship: transparency of practice and personal presence in classroom.

Awareness of the Rewards of Being a Teacher

The emphasis of the deliberate relationship on the primacy of students' needs and growth may be misinterpreted as prohibiting the personal growth or enhancement of the teacher. Nothing could be further from the truth. Students do not need martyrs to their needs or pseudo-selflessness any more than they need to be exploited. An awareness of the rewards we reap in the relationship can guard against both dangers. Scheman (1995) discusses her urge to ask her students for reassurance that her teaching is radical and makes a difference and thus that she has not then been coopted by her success in the university. She demonstrates her awareness of which needs of the teacher can be met appropriately when she argues that this is "the wrong sort of thing to ask." It is both asking to be included in the students' community when she is not a member and "asking to be absolved in the wielding of power I fully intend ... to go on wielding, asking to be granted the magical combination of knowledge and innocence, power and purity" (p. 109). In this situation Scheman acknowledges the urge to reap the emotional rewards of belonging to students' groups while retaining the power of the teacher's position.

The feminist therapeutic notion of a mutually empowering relationship in which both therapist and client grow is useful here as well. Miller and Stiver (1991) state, "We see the underlying processes of psychological growth as occurring in relationships which are mutually empathetic and mutually empowering" (p. 2). Surrey (1991b) continues this line of thought, emphasizing that mutuality should not be simplistically interpreted to endorse an illusion of sameness or an abandonment of responsibility, as the response of denial might. To her, concern that mutual growth in the therapeutic relationship is "exploitative" is based on a "zero-sum model of gratification.... If I get, you lose" (p. 11). She argues that, in fact, "an ethic of mutuality and authenticity is far more likely to keep the therapist empathetically grounded in the realities of the client's experience and well-being" (p. 11).

As teachers we do have needs in the teaching relationship, and it is appropriate for them to be met in this relationship. We learn and grow with students; as they learn, so do we. At its simplest, when I help a student struggle with

some part of research or writing, my awareness of my own processes deepens and expands. I see patterns in my students' work and thus am able to recognize them in my own. It is not only our intellectual needs that get met in the teaching relationship, however; emotional needs are met as well. Zingaro (1993), talking about the physician-patient and therapist-client relationship states it well: "The actual relationship of helping is a social connection which we need as much as, but differently than, our clients do" (unpaginated). Jordan (1991) writes on the same line: "In practice, very often in giving to another, we feel enlarged, in expanding the relationship and our understanding of it, both members are enriched" (p. 289). As teachers we meet our need to engage in a learning and a helping connection with others. This is different from being "taken care of" by our students. Thus some needs of the teacher can and should be met in the teaching relationship, but these must be carefully defined and consciously chosen—as Scheman (1995) illustrates—rather than unconsciously met.

Explicit Awareness of Power

A number of authors have discussed the ways feminist teachers in particular are vulnerable to creating teaching relationships that obscure power differences. Our own experiences of powerlessness—as women in society, as junior or less respected members of the academy, for example—may blind us to the way that, in relation to students, we are nonetheless powerful. We are also caught because we recognize that our power in the classroom is not unmitigated. Indeed, women teachers, teachers of color, and others whose bodies visibly signify their difference from those who traditionally have had power in the academy often have their power and authority challenged—or simply ignored—by students. Teachers do experience harassment and discrimination in the classroom on the basis of their racial, sexual, and linguistic identities; when this happens it makes the task of acknowledging and carrying our power responsibly that much more difficult and confusing (Hoodfar, 1992).

Scheman (1995) talks about how it is nonetheless psychologically easier to focus on threatened privilege than on held privilege, and how she must unlearn the sense of her position she learned as a graduate student and junior academic. "I have to learn ... how to allow for the difference in weight my words carry.... I am in a position to make things happen" (p. 110). Thus, to respond deliberately to our power and authority, we must be clear that we have it, and we must be clear when we do and do not have it. We must teach with the awareness that tolerating challenges to our authority in the name of egalitarianism and empowerment may in some cases represent a healthy coming-to-power of our students and in others may allow dominant relations of oppression to continue unchallenged in the classroom. The deliberate relationship is built on a certainty that the relationship involves a power differential and that the person in the position of power has a responsibility to be careful about the sources and the limits of our power and authority. As Lather (1991) says, "To deconstruct authority is not to do away with it but to learn to trace its effects, to see how authority is constituted and constituting" (p. 144).

Some of the metaphors feminist teachers have chosen for the task of teaching may obscure power difference in another way. Currie (1992), for example, critiques maternal metaphors both for the way they hide power differences and

the way they neglect important tasks of the feminist teaching agenda. Although teachers may “consciously treat ... students with compassion and sensitivity, objectively we are part of a power structure. To suggest otherwise grossly oversimplifies our task by leaving unaddressed those contradictions we face as feminist teachers, as well as those students subjectively express” (p. 353).

One of the contributions of feminist theorizing about power differentials in, for example, standpoint theory, is the awareness that those in positions of power are much more likely to be unaware of their power than those in positions of powerlessness. Attention to our positionality as teachers is essential to the responsible use of our power. We must ensure that the rewards we reap from teaching are not damaging to those we teach. We must also exercise self-discipline that acknowledges our power where we have it rather than indulging in the pseudo-purity of powerlessness.

The Limits of Power

The deliberate practice of teaching requires that we acknowledge two kinds of limits on our power as teachers. First, our power is limited because we teach in a larger cultural, social, and institutional context. We must not pretend—to ourselves or to our students—that we can single-handedly create classrooms that are immune to the pressures of these contexts. Briskin and Coulter (1992) remind us that interactions between students act out dynamics of oppression in the larger society. Although teachers are responsible for attempting to interrupt these dynamics where they can, teachers must also accept “the limits on their individual ability to shape their classrooms at the same time they take up the challenge to work with the classroom as an environment collectively produced by teachers and students” (p. 258). This first limit on our power is externally imposed.

The second limitation on our power must be internally imposed. The power of the teaching relationship may tempt us not to abdicate our power, but in some situations to exercise power in ways that reach beyond our expertise and authority. One such way is to indulge in interference in students’ lives. In the legends of the paternalistic model of teaching, we hear of professors who felt entitled to comment not only on their students’ work, but also on their personal lives, choice of partner, and personal priorities. As professors we are qualified to comment on the quality of students’ academic work. Our own awareness of the inseparability of our personal and professional lives makes us aware that students’ lives may be similarly connected. This knowledge authorizes us to point things out—to encourage students to use their personal passions to fuel their academic work, for example. It may also authorize us to note when emotional, medical, or other issues are interfering with academic work. But our position as teacher does not authorize us to give medical, legal, psychiatric, or moral advice or instruction. Our position as teacher, rather, requires us to be mindful of the ways we speak. Because we cannot shrug off the power of the position, we must be aware that seemingly casual comments or advice may carry more weight than we intend or desire.

A second temptation is to work beyond the limits of our academic expertise or energy. Knowledge of our limits requires us to accept only work we can do. Working with students who stretch us at the very edges of our expertise is one

of the inestimable rewards of teaching; working with students beyond our expertise is harmful. Murray et al. (1996) refer to this as the principle of “content competence” (unpaginated). Similarly, we must only promise students what we can give without rancor. It is each teacher’s responsibility to judge, as best he or she can, the work and expertise required in each student’s request and to accept only those obligations that can be met. Having accepted that responsibility, it is our obligation to meet it or, in the case of an emerging inability to meet it, to arrange for someone else to meet it. It is the teacher’s responsibility, not the student’s, to ensure that the limits of our expertise, time, and commitment are not exceeded.

Power as a Shifting Dynamic

I am convinced that the deliberate relationship requires us to acknowledge that we have power and to accept the responsibility to use it in the interests of teaching and social change, but this must not be read as conviction that we must cling to that power. The deliberate relationship purposefully supports students’ increasing ability to claim power over time. Our relationships with students shift as they change. As Litner, Rossiter, and Taylor (1992) explain, such teaching is an effort to change the “hierarchical nature of the student-teacher relationship, which defines the teacher as *the* source of knowledge and the student as unknowing. Implied in empowerment of students is a gradual shift in our teaching role from expert to partner” (p. 295). One of the primary—if risky and scary—strategies they recommend is to present the “knowledge of the discipline while constantly undermining its universality” (p. 299). The necessity of doing so, they remind us, comes from the recognition that “when we present ourselves as infallible, we increase students’ propensity to see knowledge itself as universal” (p. 296). Presenting ourselves as infallible also promotes students’ tendency to discount themselves as knowers, if they are aware of their own shortcomings, or to present themselves as infallible in order to have their claims to knowledge taken seriously.

Although we may (indeed, will) change with students, it is *their* changes in expertise, independence, and comprehension of the complexity of knowledge claims that shape how power shifts between us. In my own work leading groups of students in collaborative research projects, I have learned to recognize shifts in the relationship between myself and students. At the beginning of my work I have held more control over both process and product than I have at the end. Niks (1995) has described the evolution of one of those projects as a situation in which students gradually took on more responsibility and authority in the project. A transition in our relationship was marked by a “rebellion” of the graduate student members of the team as they protested their exclusion from participation in consultations between the principal investigators and the project’s advisory committee. As students’ research expertise grew, so did their power and authority in the project. Thus the deliberate relationship has to achieve yet one more important balancing act: to hold power where it is necessary and appropriate and to recognize when holding power becomes hoarding power.

Transparency of Practice

Our work with students to increase their *responsible* use of power in the classroom tends to take place through some common teaching strategies. These strategies, to be sure, do not come from a set list of pedagogical techniques, but rather from what Manicom (1992) calls, in her conceptualization of feminist pedagogy, “a set of *things to think about*” (p. 383). What I call the transparency of practice provides an important way of approaching teaching that, in my experience, tends to increase my reflectiveness and my openness to careful consideration of the way I use power in the classroom. I present transparency in terms of three central practices: explaining procedures and intentions, setting rules, and analyzing power dynamics.

At its simplest, transparency of practice means explaining to students what we are doing—or what we *think* we are doing—and why we are doing it. Explaining our thoughts and our hopes to students requires that we explain them to ourselves as well; transparency thus supports the effort to be deliberate in our practice. Giving explanations leads students to believe that they are entitled to explanations; it encourages students’ growth in the direction of greater ability to challenge abuses of power. Transparency of practice may be as simple as telling students why we believe a particular assignment is important and what we expect them to learn from it. This explanation opens up the possibility that students will disagree with us about our methods—or our goals—and that we will have to listen to them and respond. Thus transparency of practice sets in motion a dynamic of empowerment.

Setting such conversations in motion is one of the primary intents of transparent practice—indeed, of the whole deliberate relationship. Hill (1990) warns us that to negotiate some of our authority authorizes “students’ right to author some of that situation” (p. 93). If we are going to do this, she warns, we need to be clear about whether our “hearts are willing to legitimize the answering voices of ... students, and if there are borders beyond which [we] ... are not willing to negotiate with those voices” (p. 93). Encouraging students to negotiate authority with us requires a commitment to listening to their voices and then making a decision about how to respond. Ironically, transparency of practice simultaneously challenges our being in charge and requires a tight hold on the conviction that we are, and should be, in charge of certain elements of the educational encounter.

A second frequent manifestation of transparency includes establishing explicit rules for classroom behavior. Teachers’ establishment of ground rules for classroom behavior moves previously unconscious or hidden norms of interaction to the front of students’ and teachers’ awareness; it makes them suitable topics for conversation. Hoodfar (1992) further explains that less privileged students are empowered by classroom ground rules because rules provide “boundaries within which to assess critically the classroom dynamics, the course material, and the social structure.” More privileged students, she maintains, are also productively challenged by such rules because they “promote privileged members’ consciousness of how they, by virtue of their social position, may participate in the oppression of others” (p. 305).

Establishment of such ground rules leads more or less smoothly to analysis of the power dynamics of society and the classroom. Many feminist pedagogi-

cal thinkers encourage teachers deliberately and openly to use their own position of power in the university and the classroom as a place to begin for discussion of broader issues of power. Currie (1992), for example, argues that, ironically, we must “emphasize our position in the classroom as one of power, rather than ... testify or obscure the very real ways we are agents in an oppressive institution” (p. 359). Similarly, Hoodfar (1992) encourages teachers to locate themselves within the structure of society and the classroom. “Taking advantage of teachers’ privileged position in the classroom, they can help students recognize that their interactions with one another and with their teachers are structured by the inequalities of power between them” (p. 304).

Presence

Such explication of the teacher’s position begins to break another powerful but frequently unspoken rule of earlier teaching techniques: to avoid or evade discussion of the teacher’s personal life. Teaching from a place of personal presence is essential to the project of demystifying power. Presence in the teaching relationship means being a genuine person in our interactions with students. It begins with sharing those small details that allow our personal lives to show through the professional demeanor, but it is much more profound than that. The most essential element is to enact the belief that real people do the work we do. We get indigestion and stay up all night with our children. More, we have days of self-confidence and days of doubt. Published articles do not appear magically when we sit down at the computer; we have to work at them. This level of presence and disclosure sends the message to students that *their* indigestion, children, doubts, and difficulties are not fatal flaws.

Personal presence does *not* mean burdening students with the responsibility to attend to our emotional needs; Stiver’s (1991) description of “caring about” in therapy is parallel to what I mean by personal presence in the deliberate relationship. In effective therapy, she maintains, therapists care *personally* about their clients, and are personally present. This does not mean that they “become emotionally involved with their patients, either in the service of gratifying their own needs or through misunderstanding their patients’ needs” (p. 251). In teaching, personal presence allows students to learn with us as well as about us; if we feel obliged to maintain a professional position of unwavering certainty and expertise, we deprive students of this opportunity. Beck (1983) concludes that self-disclosure is not as important as “the state of being ready to self-disclose.... That kind of readiness means an internal integration and a willingness to take risks that allows for the unexpected in the teaching process” (p. 291).

In this way presence challenges the dichotomy between the personal and the public. Insistence on wholeness contests systems that hide privilege. Presence is thus in itself a feminist practice that enacts the belief that lives are not disconnected, discrete units, but integrated wholes. In acting as whole people we encourage our students to regard themselves—and those they will study with or serve—as complex wholes (Tom, 1993). As Karamcheti (1995) argues (making a slightly different point), “we always teach, at some level, the personal but usually unspoken story of ourselves in the world. We teach with

ourselves as our own most effective visual aids.... [This may] even reveal the illusory nature of impartiality, objectivity, and authority itself" (p. 138).

Conclusion

Rules for behavior sooner or later miss or misrepresent the issue at hand. Our practice needs to be guided by a clear commitment to an ethical and empowering philosophical frame rather than a set of rules. Rules are an important place to start expressing expectations and principles, but the commitment and principles underlying those rules, not their literal commandments, must direct our actions. Otherwise we run the risk of fossilizing and making artificial what should be fluid and genuine. Thus what I am suggesting here is a set of principles—to be reflected and built on—that help us choose the appropriate behavior in each situation, with each changing and growing individual to whom we are responsible.

In our work with students and others it is essential that we honor, but not enshrine, the power differential inherent in the relationship. It is essential that we support students' efforts to increase their own efficacy in the academic world. Specious privilege must be assiduously separated from the power needed to do what we are trying to do; the roots of the power that seems necessary to each task must be questioned every time we assume a position of power. Over time, the meanings and requirements of our power in relationships will be changed by other changes—in the people with whom we have relationships, in ourselves, in our understanding of relationships of power, and, I hope, in the institutions and environments in which we live, learn, and grow.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the many people—students, children, colleagues, and research participants—who have fed the thinking in this article. In particular, this article has been nurtured in conversations over the years with Linde Zingaro. I am indebted to Jane Dawson and Hope Mooney for their gracious and essential assistance.

Notes

1. I have chosen to use the voice of the faculty member in this discussion, hence the use of the pronoun *we*. In doing so I speak from a position of power and authority while acknowledging that we are all simultaneously in positions of power over others and positions of subordination to the power of others. My focus here is on the choices each of us must make about how we carry the responsibility of our power in the world.
2. They speculate, as well, on the implications of these lacunae for our understanding of men's development.

References

- Alcoff, L. (1991). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural critique*, 20, 5-32.
- Beck, E. (1983). Self-disclosure and the commitment to social change. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education* (pp. 285-291). Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Briskin, L., & Coulter, R.P. (1992). Introduction—Feminist pedagogy: Challenging the normative. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 17, 247-263.
- Brown, L.M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Culley, M., & A. Diamond. (1985). The politics of nurturance. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), *Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching* (pp. 11-20). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Currie, D.H. (1992). Subjectivity in the classroom: Feminism meets academe. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 17, 341-364.

- DeChiara, P. (1988). The need for universities to have rules on consensual sexual relationships between faculty members and students. *Canadian Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 21, 137-162.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.K. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Friedman, S. (1985). Authority in the feminist classroom: A contradiction in terms? In M. Culley and C. Portuges (Eds.), *Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching* (pp. 203-208). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gagne, M.C. (1992). *Gender equity in education*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Gardner, S., Dean, C., & McKaig, D. (1989). Responding to differences in the classroom: The politics of knowledge, class, and sexuality. *Sociology of Education*, 62, 64-74.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., Lyons, N.P., & Hanmer, T.J. (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hill, C.E. (1990). *Writing from the margins: Power and pedagogy for teachers of composition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hitt, J., Blythe, J., Boswell, J., Botstein, L., & Kerrigan, W. (1993, September). New rules about sex on campus. *Harper's Magazine*, pp. 33-42.
- Hoffman, F.L. (1986). Sexual harassment in academia: Feminist theory and institutional practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(2), 105-121.
- Hoodfar, H. (1992). Feminist anthropology and critical pedagogy: The anthropology of classrooms' excluded voices. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17, 303-320.
- hooks, b. (1988). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Jordan, J.V. (1991). Empathy, mutuality and therapeutic change: Clinical implications of a relational model. In J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 283-290). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jordan, J.V., Kaplan, A.G., Miller, J.B., Stiver, I.P., & Surrey, J.L. (Eds.). (1991). *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Karamcheti, I. (1995). Caliban in the classroom. In J. Gallop (Ed.), *Pedagogy. The question of impersonation* (pp. 138-146). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Keller, E.A. (1990, January-February). Consensual relationships and institutional policy. *Academe*, 29-32.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lederman, R. (1990). Pretexts for ethnography: On reading fieldnotes. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology* (pp. 71-91). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Litner, B., Rossiter, A., & Taylor, M. (1992). The equitable inclusion of women in higher education: Some consequences for teaching. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17, 286-302.
- MacKinnon, C. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Manicom, A. (1992). Feminist pedagogy: Transformations, standpoints, and politics. *Canadian Journal of Education* 17, 365-389.
- Marcus, G.E. (1994). What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 563-574). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J.B. (1991a). The development of women's sense of self. In J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 11-26). New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, J.B. (1991b). Women and power. In J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 197-205). New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, J.B., & Stiver, I.P. (1991). *A relational reframing of therapy* [Work in progress]. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center, Wellesley College.
- Murray, H., Gillese, E., Lennon, M., Mercer, P., & Robinson, M. (1996). *Ethical principles in university teaching*. North York, ON: Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
- Niks, M.I. (1995). *Teaming up in collaborative ethnographic research*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia.

- Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research* (pp. 30- 61). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Paludi, M.A., Grossman, M., Scott, C.A., Kindermann, J., Matula, S., Ostwald, J., Dovan, J., & Mulcahy, D. (1990). Myths and realities: Sexual harassment on campus. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 1-14). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Patai, D. (1991). US academics and Third World women: Is ethical research possible? In S.B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 137-154). London: Routledge.
- Rich, A. (1985). Taking women students seriously. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), *Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching* (pp. 21-29). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ricker, D. (1993, September). Love lessons: Is student /teacher dating a private affair? *Student Lawyer*, 15-17.
- Rutter, P. (1989). *Sex in the forbidden zone*. New York: Fawcett Crest.
- Scheman, N. (1995). On waking up one morning and discovering we are them. In J. Gallop (Ed.), *Pedagogy. The question of impersonation* (pp. 106-116). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stacey, J. (1991). Can there be a feminist ethnography? In S.B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 111-120). London: Routledge.
- Stern, C.S. (1993, March 10). Colleges must be careful not to write bad policies on sexual harassment. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B1-2.
- Stiver, I.P. (1991). The meaning of care: Reframing treatment models. In J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 250-267). New York: Guilford Press.
- Surrey, J.L. (1991a). Relationship and empowerment. In J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 162-180). New York: Guilford Press.
- Surrey, J.L. (1991b). What do you mean by mutuality in therapy? In J.B. Miller, J.V. Jordan, A.G. Kaplan, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey, *Some misconceptions and reconceptions of a relational approach* (pp. 10-14). [Work in progress]. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center, Wellesley College.
- Tom, A. (1993). Women's lives complete: Methodological concerns. In B. Long & S. Kahn (Eds.), *Women, work, and coping* (pp. 32-50). Montreal, PQ: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Tom, A. (1996). Building collaborative research: Living the commitment to emergent design. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 9, 347-360.
- Tuana, N. (1985). Sexual harassment in academe: Issues of power and coercion. *College Teaching*, 33(2), 53-63.
- Wagner, E.N. (1993, May 26). Fantasies of true love in academe. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Zingaro, L. (1993). *Coping with "difficult" patients*. Vancouver, BC: Department of Family Practice, University of British Columbia.

Anne E. Elliott

and

Vera E. Woloshyn

Brock University

Some Female Professors' Experiences of Collaboration: Mapping the Collaborative Process Through Rough Terrain¹

This article explores the experiences and perceptions of several female professors engaged in separate collaborative projects. Each project is described, and the common characteristics and developmental patterns are identified across the projects. The importance of building rapport, establishing goals and rewards, negotiation of tasks, commitment, and satisfaction are discussed in relation to successful collaborative processes.

Dans cet article on explore les expériences et les perceptions de plusieurs professeures qui étaient impliquées dans différents projets collaboratifs. Chaque projet y est décrit et l'étude comparative de tous les projets permet de dépister les caractéristiques et les méthodes de développement qu'ils ont en commun. Nous discutons l'importance des différents aspects significatifs aux processus collaboratifs en démontrant l'importance de fonder des liens interpersonnels, d'établir des objectifs et des récompenses, de négocier les tâches, de s'engager, et d'éprouver de la satisfaction par rapport à des processus collaboratifs qui ont remporté un certain succès.

Our challenge is to create a community that educates all of us, those in the university and those in the schools, a community that expands our relationships with one another and, in so doing, our knowledge and our effectiveness.

(Lieberman, 1992, p. 11)

As the pace of technology and information acquisition rapidly increases, effective collaboration with peers has become not only desirable, but essential (Castle & Giblin, 1992; Lieberman, 1992). "The ability to collaborate on both a small and large scale is becoming one of the core requisites of postmodern society" (Fullan, 1993, p. 14). Systems of all kinds are increasing their understanding of the worldwide movement toward holism that gives new value to the relationships that exist between parts that were formerly seen as discrete (Wheatley, 1994). As educators, therefore, it is imperative that we focus on the nature of collaborative relationships in order to find more effective ways of teaching, learning, and working together.

Anne E. Elliott is an assistant professor in the Preservice Department. Vera E. Woloshyn is an associate professor in the Department of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. Anne and Vera share research interests in the development and implementation of the use of effective learning strategies and teaching techniques in classroom settings. These research interests are realized by working in collaboration with teachers from local school boards.

At the same time, it is ironic that there is no clear agreement about a definition of collaboration in the literature, nor is there as yet much extensive study of the collaborative process (Goodlad, 1990; Hunsaker & Johnson, 1992). At present there is a tendency to call any working relationship collaborative, but there appears to be no agreement about the process that underlies this claim. The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences and perceptions of seven female professors involved in collaborative projects. The article focuses on common characteristics and developmental patterns found across the experiences of these women working in collaborative partnerships. Although the voices of all participants in any collaborative process are important, the focus of this article is on the voices of education faculty members.

It is widely accepted that women's experiences are quite different from men's and that researchers need to acknowledge these differences when considering new ways of working in and between educational institutions (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Ward, & Taylor, 1988). Traditionally education was viewed as the natural terrain of women. As with most positions in the Canadian workplace, however, men overwhelmingly hold power by controlling administration, ministry, and research positions (Gaskell, 1993). As we begin to work together to find new ways of interacting in these traditional institutions, women's experiences and perceptions need to be heard. The descriptions of seven collaborative experiences described in this study thus contribute by presenting women's perspectives, which have often been treated as invisible in educational research. This article, therefore, is written from the standpoint of women as "meaning-makers" (Reynolds, 1995), as we search for new understandings of what it means to collaborate in education.

We are two professors in a faculty of education, who with several female colleagues have founded a Centre on Collaborative Research. Although the term *collaboration* is used in a variety of diverse ways in the growing body of literature on this subject, in the Centre we use the term to mean co-laboring or working equitably with at least one other person on the same project or task. Although the Centre was founded in an open and inclusive manner, only women expressed interest in membership. Then we agreed with Houston (1995) that it is "misleading to think of gender as something that can be ignored or treated as irrelevant" (p. 130). We persevered to form a research group with the added dimension of reflecting female perspectives. The Centre was founded with two objectives. The first is to encourage the establishment of equitable collaborative partnerships with field-based educators, as well as with other faculty members, thus breaking down the isolationist tradition of university life and overcoming obstacles to authentic collaboration. The second objective is to investigate the perceptions of collaboration held by those involved in the process.

One of the major obstacles to the creation of equitable and functional collaborative partnerships is confusion among partners about how collaboration functions. Huberman (1990) stated that one of the greatest obstacles to equitable educational collaboration is the distinct difference between school and university cultures. Accountability varies in each institution ranging from writing scholarly publications to conducting effective cafeteria duty (Cornbleth & Ellsworth, 1994; Cuban, 1992). As a result of such competing agendas, research

carried out by university professors can have, or can be perceived to have, little relevance for the classroom (Feldman, 1993; Hattrup & Bickell, 1993). "The assumption has been—and the reward structure has reflected it—that the highest form of inquiry, the best research, is the product of those in the university removed from the contexts of practice" (Lieberman, 1992, p. 10).

Schools and universities use different languages to describe diverse norms and values that ultimately can contribute to failed or inadequate communication (Butt, Raymond, & Yamagishi, 1988; Wagner, 1993).

According to Senge (1990), it is essential for any team to start with a dialogue in which members suspend judgment and really begin to think together. This way of interacting and learning together is similar to van Manen's (1991) hermeneutic conversations describing lived experiences and the mediation of meaning that occurs after the experience has been encountered and described. Hollingsworth (1992) also found that "collaborative conversations" were a method of both learning and supporting learning that is grounded in the social construction of personal knowledge, which emphasizes holism and the consideration of personal and emotional experience in a critical context. These rich dialogues, however, can break down when institutional differences between schools and universities create a struggle between partners concerning who is the expert and whose knowledge is legitimate (Gitlin et al., 1992). If collaborative partnerships are to develop and be functional, then both partners must be ready to give up old ways of working and move toward a relationship based on communication, mutual respect, and shared vision (Ruddick, 1992).

It may be that forging the connections necessary to bridge the theory and practice gap is congruent with the ways women learn to interact (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan et al., 1988). Female academics often lament the isolationist tradition of both the university and research discourse (Rees, 1995). It is becoming recognized that women often bring the values of caring, empowering others, listening, and responding to all their relationships either at work, in the community, or with their families (Myers & Hajnal, 1995). It is these characteristics that bring coherence and interdependence to what might otherwise be fragmented existences.

Participants

The participants in the study were seven of the founding members of the Centre on Collaborative Research who had a desire to explore the nature of collaboration. Each participant is a professor in the Faculty of Education.

Reflecting on Seven Collaborative Partnerships

Each participant was interviewed and responded to the following prompt, "Describe a collaborative project or partnership that you have completed or are currently completing." The interviews were audiorecorded and transcribed, individual narratives were written, and member checks were carried out in order to negotiate meaning. Each story was written to capture the voice of the participating professor, as well as the nature of the collaborative project.

Anne: Collaboration With a School Principal

When asked to reflect on a collaborative partnership, Anne discussed a project with a local school that was designed to increase teachers' use of collaborative

learning strategies in their classrooms. In the year prior to the project, Mary, a teacher in the school, and Anne joined forces to implement collaborative learning strategies in Mary's grade 1 classroom. Mary's principal was so supportive of their collaborative endeavor that, by the end of the school year, he made an executive decision that his entire teaching staff should use collaborative strategies in their classrooms the following year. He asked Mary and Anne if they would coordinate a school-based program. In this manner the principal became Anne and Mary's self-appointed working partner.

In a similar fashion, he directed his staff's participation in the project. He announced to Anne that the teachers wanted to "do collaborative strategies." Thus, although the project was presented to school staff under the guise of mutual decision-making, there was no true negotiation of individual needs and goals. Indeed, the principal was the only person who explicitly expressed any goals for the project.

From the beginning Anne and the principal disagreed about the best method for implementing the project. "We talked about the fact that I perceived that he wanted to mandate change and I wanted to empower it." The result was that for the majority of individuals in this project this partnership was an imposed one. Moreover, the relationship between Anne and the staff was based on professional interests, with little sharing of personal experiences and information. Anne commented, "I was uncomfortable with the project and yet I was intrigued too." It was Anne's personal interest in collaborative learning strategies and her feelings of professional obligation that in part ensured her fidelity to the project. Anne's previous relationship with Mary also motivated her to continue. If Anne had opted out of the project, Mary might have been left in the position of project coordinator, which would probably have alienated her from the other school staff.

She was very much aware that the staff was very likely to resist change and be rather resentful of anything that took extra time. She felt that her position on the staff could be badly compromised if she appeared to be part of this project, and said that she would like to be just one of the teachers.

The teachers also expressed their resentment toward the project, albeit indirectly. They worried about whether they could really afford to allocate classroom time for the implementation of the project. They expressed concern over whether the project would infringe on their personal time, and they failed to complete assignments. Minimal reading tasks that would have promoted discussion of relevant issues were usually not done.

Anne's experience did not exemplify successful collaboration, at least not from her own perspective. Although the principal expressed satisfaction with the outcome (most of the teachers successfully adopted collaborative learning procedures), Anne was not so certain about the success of the project.

Cecilia: A Collaborative Partnership with a Former Student

Cecilia chose to describe a collaborative relationship with a former graduate student and elementary teacher, Sheila. Prior to this project, Sheila had been Cecilia's first graduate student and their relationship had moved beyond the professional to include the personal. Their new project involved investigating

female superintendents with respect to their leisure, professional, and family activities.

Recognizing the new collaborative partnership, Cecilia acknowledged that both partners were consciously working to change old hierarchical patterns. This new project had been intended to be a “quick” one. Task allocation for the project was based on available time, which was minimal for both partners.

We got together and we did a division of labor. Who has time to do this and who has time to do that? This had to be done by such and such a date. We worked in a kind of turn-taking capacity.

The requirements of the study, however, became overwhelming, and they finally agreed to hire an assistant, a decision that temporarily solved the workload crisis.

Shortly before Cecilia and Sheila were to present their study at a conference, catastrophe hit. Sheila became seriously ill, had major surgery, and temporarily had to use a wheelchair. Cecilia began to feel guilty that she had not completed more of the project herself, making Sheila “do all the stuff.” At this point, Cecilia had to assume primary responsibility for the project. Cecilia overruled any of Sheila’s reservations about completing the project. “I just completely refused to enter into the discussion of that possibility and just kept talking to her about the conference.”

Although Cecilia and Sheila were able successfully to complete this project, they were never able to truly “flatten out” their relationship. The old advisor in Cecilia never quite disappeared. Cecilia further reflected that although she tends to work quickly on her own, working with others provides her with an additional perspective “that reaching the goal is only part of what the endeavor is. Greater possibilities seem to emerge when the responsibility is shared.”

Helen: A Triangular Collaboration

Helen described a collaborative project that had representation from a faculty of education, a university English department, and a local high school. Their ultimate goal was to initiate change in the way English was taught at the university to those students who intended to teach English at the high school level.

The project arose from informal discussions between Helen and Kevin, the English department head at the school where Helen was supervising student teachers. Both Helen and Kevin shared a concern that the universities were not adequately preparing students to teach English at the secondary school level. “We felt that the way in which university students were exposed to English was not the way in which teachers needed to learn about English in order to teach in secondary schools.”

Kevin established contact with two members of the university English department and interested school board personnel. They started to hold informal meetings where they discussed their perceptions about the current status and future possibilities of teacher education as it pertained to the teaching of English. Throughout this time they became familiar with and respectful of each other’s visions, thus establishing fidelity to each other.

It took a year and a half to sort out hidden agendas, but with continued discussions the problems of implementation were worked through. Finally, the

new program was born, nurtured, and approved. Throughout the process Helen would never let herself think about failure. The gradual solving of each problem and the “excitement of the collaboration” kept her motivated and encouraged.

Janis: University-School Partnership

While organizing in-school experiences for a group of preservice students, Janis worked collaboratively with a school board to create a professional development school. Currently, Janis and her colleague Tim are working on a three-year project with a local board of education. She described the project at the end of year one.

When the project was initiated Janis’s goals were twofold. She wanted to encourage and enable the board to take a greater role in teacher education, and she needed a site for student teachers both to observe experienced teachers and to practice teach. The first collaborative team started with Janis, her colleague Tim, and a consultant and superintendent from the board. Therefore, much of the initial planning for this project was carried out at an administrative level prior to designating a school that would serve as the teacher development site. Once the project had been accepted in principle, much of the early discussion was spent trying to construct a mutual vision of the collaborative site.

At the board level, Janis and Tim were careful to establish reciprocity so that it was clearly understood that the project would benefit both parties. Janis was clear that she did not want to appear to be telling the board what to do.

If it’s going to develop into collaboration, then we have to work together to see what we think teacher education is all about; how it can be improved and so on. What can we do for you? What can you do for us?

When a school was designated for the project, the collaborative process involved a new set of players: Janis, Tim, and the principal and staff of the Professional Development School. Initial concepts had to be explained and developed again. At this stage the project took concrete form with Janis and Tim suggesting that the school determine exactly how they would participate.

The school’s and the principal’s agendas gradually emerged more explicitly throughout the initial stages of conversation. They said that the process of developing and training preservice teachers would also serve as staff development for the teachers involved. Janis and Tim could also achieve their primary objective, which was obtaining a site where their student teachers could become involved and practice teach.

Because the school had control over the collaborative site, Janis and Tim sometimes felt that it was more appropriate to act like well-mannered guests than collaborative partners. Their sensitivity in this matter may partially account for the ultimate success of the project. Janis’ and Tim’s roles in the school were not always perceived consistently by everyone.

In a collaborative process, I think the roles of the participants have to emerge to some extent. Are we the bosses or are we not? Some of them perceive us as the boss. Others perceived us as the guest.

Janis believed that it was necessary to operate with some lack of clarity in order to allow the collaborative process to emerge: “I’ve learned over the years if

you're trying to do anything collaboratively there has to be a lack of clarity ... it has to be emergent to some extent."

Both parties seemed to accept this lack of clarity on faith and the strength of their relationship. More importantly, as the project continued over the year, each of the collaborative partners began to see goals being met. Although this interview was conducted when the project was only partially completed and overall satisfaction was yet to be determined, it appeared that this initial phase was deemed to be satisfactory by all partners.

Merle: A University-School Collaboration

Merle chose to describe a project where she worked with a professor from another institution. Their goal was to determine how primary teachers were assisting students who were perceived to be at risk because they were not yet thriving in school.

A number of meetings were established where researchers Merle and Adam met frequently with four groups of classroom teachers. During the meetings potential problems were identified by the teachers, and treatment techniques were developed. The strength of these meetings was the way the teachers felt they could share problems and help one another by brainstorming solutions. Merle and her partner Adam organized the meetings and served as catalysts for the discussion.

Merle believed that the nature of the discussions among the participating teachers was central to the success of the project. The discussions were problem-solving and related to each teacher's experiences and constituted "high quality talk." "I think that getting all these different people together and generating ideas was what made it work." Problems emerged but never threatened the overall completion of the project. For instance, one board assigned some teachers to the project who were hostile about being involved. With continued dialogue, resistance gradually dissipated.

Merle emphasized that the manner in which the teachers interacted among themselves was one of the most satisfying elements of the project. "We always respected the teachers and they were excited. They'd never had a chance to do this before—nobody had ever asked about their ideas before or even recognized that they had any. It was a rich experience." She also recognized that this would probably not have happened if she and Adam had not designed the project and organized the meetings. "It was important that we had ourselves there as catalysts—a couple of outsiders."

Merle's personal goals were to learn research skills from a knowledgeable partner. Although Merle and Adam attended all the meetings with the teachers together, the tasks related to the rest of the project were divided between them according to their existing strengths.

The collaborative aspect was between Adam and me in the collecting of the data, the planning, the organizing. We did all these things together, but we didn't write together. We divided up the task. He did the statistical analysis and the high powered description of findings and so on, and I did the descriptions of the teachers, the problems, the strategies, and our overall discoveries of how classrooms worked.

As they continued with the project, Merle found communication ineffective and difficult.

At the time technology kept letting us down. We would send each other computer disks and they wouldn't match or we couldn't find just the right equipment or we couldn't read each other's cards for heaven's sakes, and it was just a mess! That's why we ended up dividing the task instead of sharing those parts—it was too awful!

Thus the collaborative component became less central to this project, as partners independently completed their responsibilities.

Overall, Merle gained an appreciation of the power of collaborative processes. She perceived its strength being largely in the "generating of ideas and the creative implementation of ideas." She does, however, acknowledge the time needed to work collaboratively "is enormous" and is in conflict with the "pressures that are on us to do things fast."

Ruth: Reciprocal Partners

Ruth described a partnership with Sandra, a doctoral student at the university from which Ruth graduated. Their relationship was initiated by their mutual advisor Agnes, who felt that they could help each other achieve academic goals. The initial goals of this partnership were specified by Agnes, but were reinforced by both Ruth and Sandra as being mutually beneficial. Sandra would receive support and a mentor during the writing of her dissertation and Ruth would make contact with a classroom teacher who would be supportive of class-based projects. The way these goals would be played out, however, would be determined by both partners over time.

When Ruth and Sandra met they spent most of their time discussing difficulties they had encountered in graduate school. Both Ruth and Sandra had young families who needed their attention, and both worked full time while attending university. They found that they both experienced guilt about their perceptions of not devoting adequate time and attention to either their families or their academic studies. Sharing these common experiences appeared to create a bond between them.

Ruth's participation in this partnership, however, was confounded by feelings of obligation to her former advisor with whom she had a warm and supportive relationship. This support often made Ruth feel guilty when she was unable to meet what she believed were Agnes's expectations. To avoid this pattern with Sandra, Ruth placed definitive parameters on their relationship.

In retrospect it was evident to Ruth that she and Sandra had different expectations about her role. Although Sandra thought Ruth would act as a "whip" keeping her on track with her dissertation, Ruth rejected that role, preferring to see herself as a support person. Nevertheless, Sandra continued to see herself as accountable to Ruth. "She said I was her lifeline ... even though I did not want to play the role of the whip she still believed she has a responsibility to me and I think she chose to believe that."

This partnership was unique in that it had no specified end point or product. The role ambiguity of this partnership could be more accurately described as a starting point for future endeavors. That is, it may be the foundation upon which both participants build other projects in the future.

Susan: A Professor-Classroom Teacher Collaboration

Susan had previously developed a model of curriculum development called the Story Model. Jennifer, a classroom teacher, was interested in implementing it in her classroom under Susan's guidance. Susan and Jennifer possessed unique but compatible goals; Susan wanted to determine whether the Story Model, developed in a research setting, could be applied in a classroom; Jennifer's primary concern was to motivate her students by providing a unique learning experience.

Susan and Jennifer did not appear to establish a personal relationship at the beginning of their project, partly because Susan's university job left little time to be spent with Jennifer either professionally or socially. The initial affinity between Susan and Jennifer resulted from sharing a desire to develop techniques that would make the curriculum meaningful to students.

Early in the project Susan experienced a great deal of guilt, believing that she had not devoted adequate attention to the project. "I felt very guilty through most of this because I did not give it enough of my time and attention. I felt badly that she was on her own." Susan also believed that Jennifer experienced feelings of guilt associated with not fulfilling what she believed were Susan's expectations.

She had her own set of guilts ... that she didn't go back and read the book I'd given her and in many ways she was winging it too. So at that time, we both felt we weren't giving this our full attention.

However, there were no feelings of anger or resentment toward the other person with respect to "pulling her own weight." "We were always conscious of the other person ... we didn't want to ask too much of the other person."

Susan and Jennifer's personal relationship grew throughout the later part of the project. Establishing personal rapport with each other appeared to increase the partners' fidelity to the project. Ultimately, however, Susan attributed greater significance to the establishment of her relationship with Jennifer than to the actual project: "what came first in our collaboration was our caring for each other."

Reading and rereading the interview transcripts and narratives from all the projects, we identified several thematic components of the lived experience of collaboration. The following distinct components were identified across the seven projects: (a) Building rapport; (b) Establishing goals and rewards; (c) Negotiation of tasks; (d) Commitment; and (e) Satisfaction. To some extent each element was dependent on the others, although they did not occur sequentially in all cases.

Some Dimensions of Collaboration

Reviewing the Data

Building rapport. Women are often disposed toward an awareness of the relational aspect of their environment (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Tannen, 1990). Their attention is directed toward communicating about relational issues (Gougeon, 1995). In the projects described here a period of building rapport was a recurring theme.

As in Hollingsworth's (1992) collaborative conversations, most partners found it necessary and desirable to share prior experiences before engaging in

any specific task. Often rapport was accomplished simultaneously with setting goals and methodologies. For instance, Janis spent a great deal of time in meetings with board and school personnel prior to bringing student teachers on board. Before deciding on any action related to their project, Helen and her partners held many informal meetings. Ruth and her partner Sandra started their relationship by sharing the difficulties of balancing family, work, and graduate studies. On other occasions the getting-to-know-you period was based on a previous history. Cecilia and her partner Sheila had formerly been advisor and student. Anne and Mary had worked together on classroom projects.

On one occasion rapport was established only after the project was underway. Susan and Jennifer did not establish a strong relationship before starting the project and had an unsettled beginning. However, the project ended successfully with Susan and Jennifer building rapport throughout.

This pattern of establishing rapport may be particularly important for women. Women are culturally socialized toward developing a caring perspective in their relationships (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Ward, & Taylor, 1988). This phenomenon may explain the predominance of women in the Centre on Collaborative Research and the fact that most of our partners were also female. We apply the same principles that brought us together in the university to our collaborative partnerships with teachers. Building rapport, which was central to all the projects reported, may merely reflect many women's ways of being.

Establishing goals and rewards. A second component was the process of establishing project goals and rewards. Although it was not necessary that both partners hold the same goals, their goals must be compatible. Partners' individual goals reflected differing values in their respective workplaces. For instance, Susan's goals were research-oriented, whereas Jennifer's were related to improving her classroom teaching.

Whatever the nature of the goals, it was most important that they be stated and accepted by all parties (Elliott & Drake, 1995). The desire to recognize the partner's goals reflects the way many women prefer to work. Concern for the other and awareness of the way compatible goals contribute to the harmony of working relationships may also be a result of the way women are culturally socialized to work and live (Gilligan, 1982).

Negotiation of tasks. A third element of collaboration involved the setting of specific tasks. In most cases, this stage was negotiated according to individual areas of expertise. For instance, Merle used her knowledge of classrooms to provide qualitative insights, whereas Andy focused on quantitative analysis.

In other cases goals were not negotiated by all partners especially when one partner held a position of power over the other. Anne's partner, a principal, "volunteered" his teachers' participation. The question arises whether tasks can be truly negotiated in a collaborative manner when one partner has any type of control over the other. Cecilia acknowledged that an element of the advisor-student hierarchy was always present.

Personal rapport resulting in concern for another appeared to be an important motivator for completing tasks. Not unrelated, we think, to Noddings' (1984) "ethic of care," participants often used the word *guilt* to express this

feeling. Nevertheless, it appeared that this form of guilt had the somewhat positive effect of maintaining a sense of responsibility that worked to ensure the continuation of the project in spite of problems or setbacks. When her partner became ill, Cecilia's feelings of guilt motivated her to assume complete responsibility for their project. Anne continued with the school-based project because she did not want to leave Mary in an awkward position with her staff.

For the women in this study, being in a collaborative project with another person or persons involved holding some personal responsibility for that relationship, as well as for the goals and tasks of the project. We conclude that what they identified as guilt is not always a totally negative factor. Rather than hampering the progress of the project, it seemed at times to strengthen partners' commitment.

Commitment. There seemed to be three levels of commitment in collaborative partnerships that contributed to the necessary energy and enthusiasm required to work with others. First, there was commitment to the idea of working together collaboratively. By becoming members of the Centre on Collaborative Research all the participants in this study expressed a desire to work collaboratively.

The second and third kinds of commitment were embedded in each other, although the exact way this occurs may depend on the nature of the project, the personalities involved, and the gender of the partners. Specifically, there had to be commitment both to the goals of the project and to the partner(s). The commitment to the partner(s) appeared to be the strongest of the three when it came to ensuring the continuation of the project during times of difficulty. This commitment was often dependent on the degree of rapport among partners. For instance, Helen spent so long establishing a strong relationship with her partners that when critics said that the project could not be done, each of the partners made an extra effort to complete their tasks. Anne's commitment to Mary kept her involved in a project that she might have otherwise abandoned.

Satisfaction. The quality of the relationship with the partner(s) appeared to determine the participants' perception of the success of the project. If the relationship was strong, the partners derived some sense of satisfaction, regardless of whether the project goals were entirely met. For instance, Susan and Jennifer's relationship became so strong that they viewed their project as successful even when some of the designated tasks were not completed. Conversely, when there was little rapport between partners, satisfaction was usually minimal. For instance, Anne was never completely satisfied with her relationship with the school staff.

Reflections from the Authors' Experiences

As we read the transcripts describing each relationship and as the collaborative components began to emerge, we realized that we were undergoing the same experiences (albeit in a university setting) that we were in the process of discovering. The following describes how we experienced the pattern ourselves.

Building Rapport

We were colleagues in a faculty of education, although we belonged to different departments. We had previously worked together on a project, an expe-

rience that we perceived as successful and pleasant. Thus we had a positive orientation toward forming a productive working relationship. Throughout the course of this project we met in each other's homes and over lunches. Our conversations became personal, and friendship based on mutual respect emerged. We both acknowledged being at a time of change in our lives. Vera was just starting family life, whereas Anne was coping with the "empty nest" syndrome. Professionally, we were relatively new academics and were struggling to balance teaching and research responsibilities.

Establishing Goals and Rewards

As we began working on this project, it was immediately evident that we were both interested in understanding more about the process of collaboration. In addition, we wanted to contribute to the growth of the Centre on Collaborative Research of which we were both active members. At the same time we both had the job expectation that we conduct research and publish the results. These goals were easy for us to articulate as we came from the same institution and understood the constraints and demands that underlay our work (Cornbleth & Ellsworth, 1994).

Negotiation of Tasks

We believed that each of us had the necessary skills to complete this project. However, we also believed that we would learn from each other's expertise and decided to complete data analysis and writing this manuscript collaboratively. Together we read and coded the emerging themes. We wrote the first narrative collaboratively and divided the remaining cases. We continually edited each other's work and met regularly to write this manuscript.

Commitment

Although our commitment to the project remained unchanged, our commitment to each other deepened. We persevered with this project through the birth of Vera's babies and a major illness survived by Anne's husband. The work was an excuse to get together, discuss the article, and simultaneously provide support for each other. We agreed that the article became a vehicle to confirm our loyalty and support for each other. We began to realize that a good metaphor for the article was that of a shock absorber that cushioned the bumps on the road we were traveling. As we discussed this previously unstated phenomenon, we both felt that any commitment to our collaborative relationship not only drove the project forward, but also moved into the dimension of what Noddings (1984) called caring.

Satisfaction

This project was sustained (and in turn sustained us) over at least a two-year period, which attested to our satisfaction with the original goals and rewards. We also agreed that we gained a sense of being connected to each other as the lines blurred between the personal and the professional. Finally, each of us gained a deeper understanding and respect for the collaborative process.

We grew to believe that the way many women work together in universities has the potential to influence education in general (Epp, 1995). Different ways of working together are being identified at all levels of society. There is grow-

ing agreement that the old ways are no longer working and that creative innovations emerge when people work collaboratively.

Conclusion

We believe that we should value the contribution of female perspectives in the workplace by paying attention to the ways that women work most effectively and that women are best able to contribute to the knowledge about that process. Although we acknowledge the diversity among the women and among the collaborative relationships in this study, we have focused on the common elements in order to inform the collaborative practice for others. This orientation toward collaboration in a university setting does not reflect the traditional pattern normally associated with university advancement. We are challenging the old ways of doing educational research in traditional hierarchical relationships. By becoming members of the Center on Collaborative Research the women in this study are establishing alternative ways of working that more fully acknowledge the contributions of all partners.

Note

1. This article was written in collaboration with Sharon Abbey, Joyce Castle, Susan Drake, Cecilia Reynolds, Merle Richards, Alice Schutz, Ruth Scott, Helen Stewart, and Adele Thomas.

References

- Brown, L.M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butt, R., Raymond, D., & Yamagishi, L. (1988). Autobiographic praxis: Studying the formation of teachers' knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 87-164.
- Castle, J.B., & Giblin, A. (1992). Reflection-for-action: A collaborative venture in preservice education. *Teaching Education*, 4(2), 21-34.
- Cornbleth, C., & Ellsworth, J. (1994). Teachers in teacher education: Clinical faculty roles and relationships. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 49-70.
- Cuban, L. (1992). Managing dilemmas while building professional communities. *Educational Researcher*, 21(1), 4-11.
- Elliott, A.E., & Drake, S.M. (1995). Moving from "two solitudes" towards a "blended" culture in school/university partnerships. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organizational Development*, 13(2), 85-95.
- Epp, J.R. (1995). Insidious deterrents: When educational administration students are women. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 19-31). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Feldman, A. (1993). Promoting equitable collaboration between university researchers and school teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 6, 341-358.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 12-17.
- Gaskell, J. (1993). Feminism and its impact on educational scholarship in Canada. In L.L. Stewin & S.J.H. McCann (Eds.), *Contemporary educational issues* (2nd ed., pp. 145-160). Toronto, ON: Copp Clark Pitman.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., Ward, J.V., & Taylor, J.M. (Eds.). (1988). *Mapping the moral domain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gitlin, A., Bringhurst, K., Burns, M., Cooley, V., Myers, B., Price, K., Russell, R., & Tiess, P. (1992). *Teachers' voices for school change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). Studying the education of educators: From concept to findings. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71, 698-701.
- Gougeon, T. (1995). Teacher perceptions of male and female principals. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 157-171). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Hatrup, R., & Bickell, W. (1993). Teacher-researcher collaboration: Resolving the tensions. *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 38-41.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1992). Learning to teach through collaborative conversation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 373-404.

- Houston, B. (1995). Should public education be gender free? In L. Stone (Ed.), *The education feminist reader* (pp. 122-134).
- Huberman, M. (1990). Linkage between researchers and practitioners: A qualitative study. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 285-391.
- Hunsaker, L., & Johnson, M. (1992). Teacher under construction: A collaborative case study of teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 350-372.
- Lieberman, A. (1992). The meaning of scholarly activity and the building of community. *Educational Researcher*, 21(6), 5-121.
- Myers, F., & Hajnal, V. (1995). Reflections on the leadership styles of women in Saskatchewan adult education institutions. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 101-113). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and morals*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press.
- Rees, R. (1995). Systems discrimination in university administration in education. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 33-44). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Reynolds, C. (1995). Feminist frameworks for the study of administration and leadership in educational organizations. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 3-17). Calgary, AB: Detselig.
- Ruddick, J. (1992). Universities in partnership with schools and school systems: Les liaisons dangereuses? In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change* (pp. 194-212). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation*. Toronto, ON: Ballantine.
- van Manen, M. (1991). *Researching lived experience*. London, ON: Althouse Press.
- Wagner, J. (1993). Educational research as a full participant: Challenges and opportunities for generating new knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 6(1), 3-18.
- Wheatley, M.J. (1994). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Y.L. Jack Lam
Brandon University

Loose-Coupled Responses to External Constraints: An Analysis of Public Educators' Coping Strategies

In this study the researcher examined the patterns of adaptation of public educators to external constraints and assessed the impacts of their coping strategies on school organization. From the data provided by superintendents, principals, and teachers in four school divisions located in different parts of Manitoba, seven major coping strategies were identified. Through these coping strategies, it could be seen that in dealing with turbulent environments the education system was loosely coupled. In terms of organization-environment relationship, the adaptation pattern of the superintendents reflected the characteristics of strategic choice theory; teachers' coping patterns supported the postulation of environmental determinist theory, whereas principals' adaptations displayed a hybrid pattern encompassing the two. Further, when considering the interactive effects of these diverse coping strategies in the school organization context, some elements reflected grave organizational shortcomings whereas others showed positive potentials.

Dans cette étude le chercheur a examiné les stratégies d'adaptation qu'exercent des éducateurs et des éducatrices dans des écoles publiques envers certaines contraintes externes. De plus, il a évalué les effets de leurs comportements d'adaptation et il a pu évaluer l'impact de leurs stratégies d'adaptation sur l'ensemble de l'organisation scolaire. Sept stratégies d'adaptation majeures ont été identifiées d'après les données fournies par des surintendants et des surintendantes, des directeurs et des directrices d'écoles, et des enseignants et des enseignantes de quatre divisions scolaires de par le Manitoba. Par l'entremise de ces stratégies d'adaptation en temps mouvementés, le système éducatif se caractérisait comme un environnement dyadique. En ce qui concerne la relation organisation-environnement les stratégies d'adaptation des surintendants et des surintendantes réfléchissent les caractéristiques de la théorie des choix stratégiques. En ce qui concerne les stratégies d'adaptation des enseignants et des enseignantes, la postulation de la théorie déterministe environnementale s'appliquait tandis que pour les directeurs et les directrices, il s'agissait de stratégies d'adaptation selon un patron hybridisé composé des deux stratégies mentionnées auparavant. De plus, en considérant les effets interactifs de ces différentes stratégies d'adaptation dans le contexte d'organisation scolaire, quelques éléments reflétaient de sérieuses lacunes organisationnelles tandis que d'autres démontraient un potentiel plus prometteur.

Introduction

In the North American education scene, the accelerated pace of economic, social, technological, and to some extent cultural changes has created a turbulent external environment for the public school. In Canada such changes are further compounded by a new set of initiatives (Council of Minister of Education, Canada, 1993) undertaken by provincial governments in response to public demand for greater school accountability. These initiatives result in structural and governance change, increasing pressures on public educators.

Against a background of rapid environmental changes, the public education system fails to keep up with the unpredictable demands in order to avoid environmental shock (Hannan & Freeman, 1989). Much uncertainty and many constraints arise from such shock, because the radical changes being imposed on the organization are nonroutine and disrupt both organizational and individual inertia. The term *constraint* refers to restriction or hardship that the incumbents of organization encounter in carrying out their responsibilities when the externally induced organizational changes alter the world of work. Individuals and organizations then have to learn new patterns of communication, adapt new work routines, and forge new relations with stakeholders and clients (Hannan & Freeman, 1984; Singh, House, & Meinhard, 1988). Constraints from the external environment also come about when resource-dependent organizations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) such as the public schools are beset with funding shortages, higher political demands on productivity, students' disruptive social behaviors, and intense demands for ethnic-related programs.

The interpretation of public school-external environment relationship in terms of constraint is not new. Historically, there has been general consensus among organizational theorists (Bales, 1965; Dill, 1958; Pfeffer, 1970; Schein, 1965) that changes in the external environment impose limiting effects on the organizational operational flexibility. In addition, a prominent group of organization theorists (Aldrich, 1979), generally known as the environmental determinist school, even goes another step to assert the powerlessness of the organization; they see all outcomes as predetermined by environmental forces.

Based on the existing empirical evidence (Lam, 1994, 1996a, 1996b), superintendents, principals, and teachers in urban school divisions experience a much greater amount of pressure than their counterparts in the rural divisions. Furthermore, variation in the degree of environmental constraints seems to correspond to the hierarchical positions educators occupy such that senior administrators are subjected to higher degrees of external constraint than those below. Superintendents experience pressure in coping with funding shortages. Principals are beset with problems related to policy implementation and shifting locus of control. Teachers are most susceptible to enrollment fluctuation and students' social problems.

Areas of Concerns Related to Organizational Adaptation to Environmental Constraints

The correspondence of constraint to hierarchical level (Lam, 1991) raises a follow-up question: Do the response patterns of public educators at each level also vary greatly? If we accept Weick's postulation (1976) that positions or subunits in educational institutions retain their own identities and that their attachment may be "circumscribed, infrequent and weak in their mutual effects," we can hypothesize that the responses to external constraints from one level to another in a school system would be loosely coupled. This should help us interpret whether the professed actions or strategies of educators are characteristic of environmental determinism or of strategic choice (Astley & Van de Ven, 1983; Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1985).

Advocates of the view that the public school is a resource-dependent organization (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) embrace the perspectives of the environmental determinist school, predicting that public educators would primarily be passive, reacting to the crises and challenges as they arise. Decision-making is focused on searching for means to minimize detrimental impacts as incumbents are powerless to modify the predetermined outcomes. Changes in the existing practices are governed by technical criteria and rules (Astley & Van de Ven, 1983) to ensure that in the context of constraints, the best possible solutions are reached according to the established criteria. Furthermore, as administrators react to the exogenous forces, managerial behaviors are limited in choice, expedient, and solution-driven (Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1985).

Those who align themselves with the strategic choice school predict that public educators will be proactive, so that they will retain some degree of autonomy and self-direction in solving externally imposed problems. Decision-making emphasis will aim at reshaping the ends that are most beneficial to organizations, as alternative choices exist. Changes in existing practices are influenced by political considerations (Astley & Van de Ven, 1983) as they usually usher in a new distribution of power. And with proactive measures, organization members still have choices and time to search for solutions (Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1985).

Purpose

As a follow-up to my previous work (1991), which identified the patterns and types of external constraints experienced by 77 superintendents or assistant superintendents, 237 principals, and 1,284 teachers, the present investigation attempts to seek answer to the following questions:

1. How does each level of educators respond to environmental constraints?
2. Do the observed response patterns reflect features typified by environmental determinism or by the strategic choice school?

Answers to the first question provide valuable insights into the specific nature of the coping strategies that various levels of public educators use to deal with shocks from radical environmental transformation. Answers to the second question allow us to glimpse the theoretical goodness of fit when interpreting organization-environment relationships in terms of the strategic choice and environmental determinism schools of thought; and, second, to determine the implications that various coping strategies might have for intraorganizational dynamics.

Methodology

Research Design

Using Lam's School Environmental Constraints Instrument (1985) as probing questions, the researcher collected data from a sample of division and school administrators and their teaching staff about their coping strategies and about the impacts those strategies had on their school operation.

Specifically, interview sessions were conducted by a research team, consisting of two members, in four school divisions. Responses to the interview questions were taped and transcribed. A summary of each interview was sent to each participant to verify accuracy. Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended this procedure as one way of enhancing validity of results from qualitative

studies where the major aim is to reconstruct the perspectives of those being studied.

Supplementary to the interviews, document analyses were taken and follow-up questionnaires were sent to the participants three months after the interview sessions were completed. The documents came from three sources. First, the calendars of superintendents, principals, and teachers were examined to probe how their daily scheduled activities in the past month reflected or supported their professed coping strategies. Because most of the items in their calendars were recorded briefly, participants were approached to clarify or explain the details of those recorded actions. Second, administrative reports made by superintendents to their school boards that dealt with the actions they had taken to overcome difficulties generated by external constraints were also examined. Third, in the case of the principals and their staff, minutes of the staff meetings were examined. It was hoped that through the documentary analyses additional information could be secured to amplify or clarify data obtained from interviews.

The follow-up questionnaires distributed to the three groups of educators allowed the researcher to detect whether there were any additional changes in external constraints and response strategies.

Through the use of interviews, documentary analyses, and questionnaires, the researcher hoped to triangulate the data collected and to validate the results (Smith & Glass, 1987).

Sample

Several criteria were used in selecting the sample. First, the superintendents, principals, and teachers in this study were selected from among the three levels of educators who participated in an earlier study (Lam, 1991) related to the external constraints they experienced. Second, these educators were sampled from four different locations in Manitoba so that the effects associated with local settings could be detected. Subsequently, four superintendents were selected from metropolitan, urban, rural, and northern settings. Eight principals and eight of their teachers were also chosen to represent both the elementary and secondary schools in the chosen school divisions.

Findings

Data on the coping strategies came primarily from interviews. The follow-up questionnaire revealed no significant shift in the extent of external constraints nor changes in their adopted strategies. In this context the patterns of responses given at the interviews seemed fairly consistent. The documentary analyses reaffirmed the information given in the interviews, serving to validate their responses rather than adding extra information in response to the questions.

Comparison of Response Strategies to Environmental Constraints

Despite the deliberate sampling of educators from different localities, it was found that local extraneous factors played little part in shaping coping strategies. Rather, the roles played by the educators seemed to account for contrasting patterns of adaptation responses.

From the interview data two distinct patterns emerged from the multitude of minor variations experienced by public educators. One was the strong

similarity in the coping strategies shared by superintendents and principals. The other pattern, which contrasted with the first, was exhibited by the teaching staff. These contrasting coping strategies are discussed below.

Proactive versus reactive planning. All the superintendents and principals stressed that they adopted proactive planning as a way of coping with the external constraints. Through this approach they hoped to prepare better for the potentially adverse effects of the anticipated change. Prerequisite to proactive planning is *problem sensing* (Kiesler, & Sproull, 1982), and in this area superintendents seemed to have a distinct advantage over their principals. Having responsibility for the entire school division, these administrators had a wider perspective on their needs and a wider network for information gathering compared with their principals. Superintendents from all the four school divisions depended heavily on their colleagues and provincial professional organization for news of impending changes. Metropolitan, urban, and to some extent rural chief education officers further identified various subunits in the provincial Department of Education and Training, other branches of the provincial government, and some departments at the federal level as major sources of information. Their calendars documented calls they had regularly made to these external contacts. The follow-up questionnaires confirmed that such consultation was an ongoing and routine way of securing advance information.

Principals' interview data showed that metro and urban principals received advance information mostly from the regional office of the provincial Department of Education and Training, from their provincial organizations, and from the information passed on by their superiors. Rural and northern principals secured their information mostly from their colleagues and their superiors. With fewer external contacts—as disclosed during the interviews (and further verified from their calendars and follow-up questionnaires)—and with information that was primarily second-hand, the more isolated principals had a problem sensing threshold that was inevitably lower than that of their senior administrators.

Another area of difference between the response modes of these two levels of administrators lies in the way they treated any advance information. A case in point was the mandated structural change that involved integrating grade 9 into the senior years' program. This metro superintendent's responses were most reflective of his colleagues' feelings when he stated, "We've spent a lot of time knowing and digesting what's out there so that we'll not misinterpret the intent and consequences of potentially threatening forces ... or be caught [off-balance]."

This reflected a fairly cautious attitude toward interpreting the meanings and consequences of the externally imposed problems prior to constructing reality for themselves and their subordinates.

By comparison, principals dealt with the advance information less selectively than their superiors; they were preoccupied with finding ways to deal with the anticipated challenges. These remarks made by a metro high school principal were typical of his colleagues' response:

Whenever I receive [some] information that seems to have an adverse impact on the school, I would call a special staff meeting to deal with it, even though it's a pain in the neck for myself and my staff to have so many meetings.

Seemingly, on sensing imminent disruptive forces superintendents wished to diagnose and analyze the probable ends (or consequences) of those external threats, while principals were rushing to search for means to handle it.

In contrast to the proactive planning of their division and school administrators, the sampled teachers admitted that in dealing with external changes they were primarily defensive and reactive. Lacking sophisticated networking, teachers felt frustrated that they were the least prepared for impending changes. This sentiment was captured by an urban elementary teacher when she said, "Being at the bottom of the totem pole, we're always the last to receive the information that requires radical change on our part."

Apparently, even in times of rapid change, vertical communication in the school has not improved.

Decentralization versus diluted centralization. Environmental constraints seem to reshape power distribution in the school system. Both superintendents and principals recognized that a continued monopoly on traditional authority would weaken their positions, because tough and unpopular decisions would have to be made in many situations. The urban superintendent commented, "Unless those who are going to be directly affected by the decision are involved in the actual decision-making process, there'll be lots of ill feelings against the division administration."

The urban high school principal stressed their expertise and experiences as reasons for more staff involvement in decision-making: "We've excellent, experienced staff.... I count on them to come up with more options in dealing with difficult issues."

In spite of these assertions, most principals felt compelled to toe the division line in all aspects of school administration. The documents, memos, and decrees from their superintendents that the research team examined did support the principals' claims that the so-called site-based management was not accompanied by real transfer of authority. Ironically, as principals voiced their complaints, their urban and metro teaching staffs echoed the same disappointment with the principals themselves, saying that their school administrators had yet to show confidence in them. One urban elementary teacher's remark seemed to capture the prevailing sentiments among her colleagues: "While we're engaged more in group discussion sessions than before, we sense our principal will make the final decision—we note he still has some doubt about our ability." The metro elementary teacher expressed her feelings even more bluntly: "There has been such a deep-seated distrust between the administration and the teaching staff that we don't want to share our concerns or view, or be treated as persons who are upsetting the applecart."

The rhetoric of subordinate empowerment and the actual limited delegation of authority lead many educators to view the current decentralization as nothing more than a "diluted centralization" adopted primarily as a political ploy to pass down thorny problems to subordinates. Data from both interviews and follow-up questionnaires reflected the general perception among principals

and teachers that their increased responsibilities without greater functional autonomy headed the list of problems encountered by principals (Leithwood, Cousins, & Smith, 1990) and to a lesser extent teachers in establishing a new order of school governance.

Restructuring for redistributing responsibility versus for mutual support. Despite the lack of power transfer, all superintendents and principals decentralized their organizational structure. At the division level, irrespective of their localities, more division-wide committees were created and more responsibilities were shifted downward. Superintendents' reports to their school boards covered a wide spectrum of task forces and committees created to handle delegated or emerging functions. At the school level, aside from staff meetings, special committees and some liaison committees with communities (particularly in rural schools) were created for handling urgent problems. All these new structures apparently satisfied the political necessity of demonstrating to both incumbents and external observers that decentralization in the school system is taking place.

Interestingly enough, teachers created informal teams of their own. Two purposes seemed to govern their informal restructuring, and neither of these shared any similarity in motives with those organized by their superiors. The first type was the support team aimed at improving or acquiring new instructional skills so that they would be better prepared for the mandated curriculum changes. The rural high school teacher reasoned,

Given the tough time we are now in and the complexity we face in teaching, the one positive thing that seems to arise from the situation is we seem to get closer to each other and we develop a greater solidarity to assist each other in upgrading our instructional skills.

The other type of informal grouping is what the teachers called the problem-solving team. To tackle the emerging problems that continue to plague teachers (e.g., growing school violence and antisocial behaviors of students), metro and rural teachers provided a consulting team to their colleagues: "We need collective wisdom to deal with thorny problems as they arise ... It's just too much for any one individual to handle."

Evidently restructuring brings into the open the different motives and strategies of the division/school administrators and their teaching staff in coping with the changing contexts in which they work. The incompatible motives underlie much of the internal tension in school organizations, with consequences that are explored below.

Negotiation for organizational flexibility versus for emotional stability. With diluted centralization now in place, more domains of authority lend themselves to reclarification and renegotiation between subordinates and their superiors. To meet the grade reorganization mandated in the government high school review completed in 1988 (Department of Education and Training, 1988), for instance, the rural superintendent with the support of his principals petitioned the provincial Department of Education and Training for a slower pace of implementation so that rural schools would not be unduly disrupted. To ensure that their regional concerns were included in the revision of the

Public School Act, the northern and metro superintendents together with their principals gave presentations to the Review Panel hearings.

In a similar fashion, metropolitan, urban, and rural principals negotiated with their superintendents to achieve modifications in the budget reallocations. To accommodate new curriculum initiatives, urban, rural, and northern teachers negotiated with their principals to obtain a more relaxed scope and pace of implementation. At times teachers resorted to writing counterproposals to their superiors so that their anger about inadequate preparation for new curriculum implementation could be reined in. This sentiment was captured by a metro elementary teacher who stated, "Writing [a] counterproposal is a psychological safety valve for us to vent our frustration without becoming subversive."

In sum, restructuring opens many doors for the incumbents in the school system to negotiate for a new order of operation. Such negotiated order (Bacharach & Lawler, 1982, Lam, 1993; Martin, 1976) aims at buying time for alternative responses to the pressure. It provides greater flexibility for individual adjustment to external demands and converts manifest or latent conflict into legitimized interpersonal interaction in the system.

Routinization of emerging issues. Arising from external constraints were many problems that were either ill-structured, highly complex, or undetected in advance by environmental scanning. The sudden announcement of provincial funding cuts, the mandated implementation of all-inclusive program changes, the unexpected outbursts of student violence in class, and the flaring of inter-ethnic group tension from minor incidents were some of the nonroutine problems cited by both levels of administrators and by teachers.

Because knowledge for prescribing a script or a well-rehearsed sequence of actions was unavailable for this type of problems (Shank & Abelson, 1977), the division/school administrators and the teaching staffs found themselves scrambling in a heuristic search for alternative plans of action to resolve these crises. All those interviewed recognized the need to routinize the process for solving nonroutine problems if they were not to be caught in a never-ending cycle of resolving emerging problems.

In their separate interviews superintendents, principals, and teachers shared three common approaches to dealing with these issues. First, whenever some feasible solutions were formulated, they started adopting them as prototype strategies and transcribed them into division/school policies or standard procedures for reference in handling similar issues that might occur later. Second, they considered it necessary to seek input from special interest groups in the community (e.g., parent councils, Native advocacy groups, special needs student advisory groups) when formulating guidelines. By including key stakeholders in the process of policy formulation, superintendents and principals in particular hoped to forestall potential challenges from their constituencies about the actions taken. Third, they saw value in creating special committees in the school and division to handle difficult cases. In so doing, they routinized structures to handle nonroutine issues. By adopting these approaches the public educators in the study hoped to stabilize their working environments and to regain sanity at a time of high constraints and stress.

Boundary spanning activities. All sampled public educators felt compelled to step beyond their traditional domains, reaching out to different stakeholders. By comparison, superintendents seemed to adopt the most comprehensive approaches by fostering strategic alliances with community stakeholders. To generate public sympathy for funding cutbacks, for instance, the urban superintendent spoke to the chamber of commerce and to city council and contacted opposition parties in the provincial legislative assembly. The northern superintendent involved his community in reducing high attrition rates among the high school students and developing division policies for promoting greater interracial harmony. The rural superintendent organized a two-day public forum to develop a five-year strategic plan jointly with the professional staff. The metro superintendent worked on a regular basis with different social agencies to tap their services without incurring additional expense to his school division.

The outreach activities undertaken by the principals were on the whole low in profile and modest in scale. Although they initiated contact with special interest groups in order to garner support from time to time, they admitted that these outreach activities were of secondary importance to internal management. As such, they had yet to develop a holistic and well-integrated set of approaches to boundary spanning activities.

Teachers, particularly those from the metro, urban, and northern school divisions, also indicated their increased contacts with parents whose children were in trouble, so that coordinated home-school attempts at problem solving could be planned. At times they also began to solicit assistance from social agencies and police as part of coping with children in serious trouble.

The far more limited engagement of principals and teachers compared with that of superintendents in boundary spanning activities can be attributed to their traditional insider focus (Boyd & Crowson, 1981). They were continually preoccupied with internal maintenance tasks, even when they recognized that school alone could not handle all the problems. Lacking the training and background experiences, they were admittedly quite uncomfortable and ambivalent about aggressive outreach activities.

Alternate resource generation. Government funding reductions and the restriction on boards' freedom to raise money through special levies compelled both superintendents and their principals to look for alternate resources. Establishing endowment funds from corporate donors (as in the case of the urban superintendent), coordination of multilevel fundraising (in the case of the rural superintendent), hiring of full-time fundraisers (in the case of the metropolitan superintendent) were some means that the superintendents contemplated for securing new sources of revenue. Principals were equally innovative in this domain. A case in point was described by a northern elementary school principal: "We've worked out a deal with the supermarket. We encourage parents to shop on Tuesday nights when business is normally slow. In return they donate 15% of the profit for school use."

The metropolitan high school principal convinced some computer companies to donate hardware to his labs, whereas his counterpart in the elementary school worked jointly with a few schools to secure federal grants for servicing inner-city students. The urban elementary principal initiated and

obtained an inner-city grant in order to hire an additional counselor who could assist some special needs children. The rural high school principal successfully tapped federal government funding to develop a Native language program.

In their separate searches for alternate sources of funding, an urban high school principal's remarks best captured the sentiment of his colleagues: "We've changed from the money gatherers to money hunters."

In addition, when a budgetary situation became critical, the rural high school principal—perhaps not alone—was engaging in what he called a creative budgetary process, that is, "beg, borrow, and steal funds from one category to another" to balance the books.

In contrast with the initiatives undertaken by the superintendents and principals, teachers were in general passive in their responses to funding constraints. When funds for instructional purposes were in short supply, for instance, the northern high school teacher would attempt to "stretch the budget as much as possible." To raise additional revenue all teachers sought permission from their principals to charge users' fees. Where there was fundraising in school they followed the lead of their principals.

Assessing Response Patterns in Theoretical Goodness of Fit and Organizational Implications

Judging from the response strategies adopted by superintendents, principals and teachers, it would seem that coordination among educators at the three levels were the exception rather than the rule. In most situations responses of the three groups of public educators were fairly disjointed and different from each other. Weick's (1976) concept of loosely coupled systems best describes incumbents' reactions to externally imposed changes.

These apparent differences in adaptation patterns may be due to at least three interrelated factors. First, the differential positions along the organizational chart, for one, dictate the scope of their perspective about the changing environment and about their distinctive job concerns. Second, the differential problem-sensing skills, partly attributed to the varying extent of the established networks for environmental scanning, and partly a result of their different experiences, account for the types of planning that are put in place and for the degree of readiness in counteracting externally induced problems. Third, the inadequate dissemination of vital information in the school system, and perhaps the varying role expectations of incumbents, combined to help explain the different thresholds of awareness for forthcoming changes. This in turn led to apparently uncoordinated responses among three levels of educators to external constraints.

Two remaining issues need to be addressed: (a) how do we make sense of these disjointed patterns of responses in the context of the two schools competing for interpreting the organization-environment relationships? and (b) what implications do these disjointed patterns of responses have for intraorganizational dynamics?

Theoretical goodness of fit. To the extent that the sampled superintendents had established extensive networking to scan advancing external forces, we can accept their claims that their response patterns to the external constraints were proactive. Their strategies of cushioning potentially disruptive impacts, includ-

ing extensive boundary spanning activities, also reflected their readiness to shift from their traditional focus on internal system and school board matters to building strategic alliances with stakeholders in the community. In this respect, they mustered a greater autonomy and a higher sense of self-direction in redefining their own roles than did their subordinates. To the extent that they decentralized to preserve their integrity, we can agree that political considerations certainly play a key role in balancing their self-interest and political dynamics in the school system. Their demonstrated effort to delay program and organizational changes through negotiation with the provincial Department of Education clearly demonstrates their intent to buy more time for wider choices in order to ensure that desirable ends can be achieved in a more orderly manner. In view of all these characteristics pertaining to their administrative acts, the sampled superintendents' response pattern reflects what the strategic choice school of thought depicts.

The response pattern adopted by the principals in coping with external pressure was generally proactive given that they too have developed some type of information networking. On the other hand, because they have not been empowered to exercise full authority in school-based management, we should describe their strategies as role-directed. Their actions are, therefore, a mixed bag of political considerations (balancing self-preservation and intraorganizational dynamics) and of actions strictly governed by technical criteria and rules to appease their superiors. Like the superintendents, principals resorted to negotiation as a delaying tactic to secure time for their schools in the search for more alternative means to accomplish the tasks prescribed by external demands. If they were successful in their delaying tactics, the need to make expedient decisions was minimized. If not, expediency governed their administrative actions. In this context, the coping strategies of the sampled principals displayed a hybrid pattern reflective of characteristics of both environmental determinism and strategic choice schools. Thus the theoretically rigid dichotomy of categorizing the organization-environmental relationship into either of the two schools as if the two were mutually exclusive no longer seems valid.

The response pattern adopted by teachers in dealing with external constraints was understandably reactive and role-directed, in the absence of networking and of inadequate information dissemination in the school system. In the emerging crises, they were primarily solution-driven, in search of expedient means to surmount the difficulties encountered. In sum, what is described in the environmental determinist school found empirical support in the teachers' adaptation behaviors.

Implication of the loose-coupled responses for the school system. Amid a wide range of loose-coupled responses displayed by the sampled educators, some strategies show potential for enhancing organizational effectiveness in time of difficulties. The routinization of problem-solving processes, if widely adopted, could rescue public educators from the whirlpool of crisis management. The search for alternative resources unleashes the innovation of public educators in new revenue generation, freeing them from dependency on the traditional sources, which are dwindling in the face of the current deficit controls being exercised by both federal and provincial governments. Boundary spanning

activities underscore renewed vigor in attempts to build strategic alliances among stakeholders, constructing additional buffers against further onslaughts from the turbulent environment.

On the other hand, the rapid environmental changes are not synchronic with the internal organizational restructuring, and this is likely the outcome of some organizational inertia (Haveman, 1992). Incumbents are adhering to their time-honored perspectives, while attempting on an ad hoc basis to undertake new responsibilities. Furthermore, the adaptation patterns of superintendents, principals, and teachers also reveal many intriguing intraorganizational and intrapersonal phenomena that have profound negative impacts on current school reform efforts. The disjointed pattern of planning among the three groups of educators, for instance, highlights the incoherent reactions to external pressure, creating much uncertainty and frustration at the lower level of the organizational hierarchy.

Two possible consequences could be observed. First, as mentioned above, the unequal amount of information received by educators in different organizational roles and the inadequate information sharing in the system render those at the top more prepared for change than their subordinates. Ironically, the classroom educators who are ultimately responsible for the successful implementation of reform are also the most frustrated with inadequate advance notice and preparation. Second, the uncoordinated planning, probably a reflection of the half-hearted decentralization process on the part of the division/school administrators, registers some psychological dissonance between the desire to hang onto traditional authority and the trend of shifting responsibilities downward. This suggests some disorientation on the part of educational leadership at a time of rapid transformation. The transforming system without a transformed leadership creates a sharp contrast between the rhetoric of empowerment and the actual experience of distrust. This takes a toll on the solidarity among educators in the face of external challenges. Negotiation, although buying some time for the system to adjust to the externally imposed change, heightens the political interaction between the superordinate and the subordinate in an unhealthy climate of mutual suspicion. This may intensify their separate attempts to achieve self-preservation, rather than promoting cooperative work toward the collective well-being of the system.

Conclusion

The strategies adopted by three levels of Manitoban public educators for coping with radical external changes underscores the loose-coupled nature of responses, as Weick has hypothesized (1976), in situations where separate spheres of influence permit some degrees of autonomy and discretion in making decisions.

When considered individually for theoretical goodness of fit, the coping strategies adopted by superintendents were characteristic of the strategic choice school of thought, depicting the retention of individual initiatives while experiencing much external constraint. The strategies adopted by classroom teachers, on the other hand, reflected characteristics typified by the environmental determinist school, suggesting that this group of educators has become passive and reactive to external changes. The strategies chosen by principals

revealed a hybrid pattern consisting of characteristics of both schools of thought. Given that there are three distinct patterns of responses from the same organizations in diverse settings, it seems safe to conclude that the rigid classification of organization-environment relationship into one school of thought or another is not empirically supportable.

Taken holistically, these coping strategies adopted by three levels of public educators disclose intraorganizational dynamics that have both positive and negative potential for the current changes. The routinization of problem solving and the search for alternate sources of revenue pinpoint public educators' conscientious attempts to enhance organizational effectiveness beyond the traditional frame of reference. However, the uncoordinated planning process at different levels of the school system, the inadequate internal communication, and half-hearted attempts at power-sharing cultivate a climate of distrust and jeopardize solidarity among educators who are all the while facing mounting external challenges. There is a delicate balance between the positive and negative features of the adaptive patterns nested in school organizations, as shown by the differential responses to external environmental constraint. The success or failure of current attempts to revamp the public school system spearheaded by Manitoba provincial government hangs on the ability of division/school administrators to recognize an emerging situation that departs radically from the past, and to transform their own leadership in ways that tap the synergy (Muth, 1984) of mutual empowerment with their staff.

Acknowledgment

The project was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada #410-91-0050.

References

- Aldrich, H.E. (1979). *Organizations and environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Astley, W.G., & Van de Ven, A.H. (1983). Central perspective and debate in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 245-273.
- Bacharach, S.B., & Lawler, E.J. (1982). *Power and politics in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bales, R.F. (1965). Adaptive and integrative changes as a source of strain in social system. In P. Hare, E. Borgatta, & R.F. Bales (Eds.), *Small groups* (pp.127-131) New York: Knopf.
- Boyd, W.L., & Crowson, R.L. (1981). The changing conception and practice of public school administration. In D.C. BeMiner (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (p. 9). Washington, WA: American Educational Research Association.
- Council of Minister of Education, Canada. (1993). *Joint declaration: Future directions for the Council of Minister of Education, Canada (CMEC)*. Ottawa: Author.
- Department of Education and Training, Manitoba. (1988). *Challenges and changes: Report of Manitoba High School Review Panel*. Winnipeg, MB: Government Press.
- Dill, W.R. (1958). Environment as an influence on managerial autonomy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 409-443.
- Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 149-164.
- Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haveman, H.A. (1992). Between a rock and a hard place: Organizational change and performance under conditions of fundamental environmental transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 48-75.
- Hrebiniak, L.G., & Joyce, W.F. (1985). Organizational adaptation: Strategic choice and environmental determinism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 336-349.
- Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1982). Managerial response to changing environments: Perspective on problem-sensing from social cognition. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 548- 570.

- Lam, Y.L.J. (1985). Relationship between size and setting and the environmental constraint of the public school system. *Administrator's Notebook*, 31(9).
- Lam, Y.L.J. (1991). A role-specific analysis of the impact of external environment on school systems. In S.C. Holmberg & K. Samuelson (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th annual Meeting of the International Society for Systems Science*, III (pp. 100-129). Ostersund, Sweden: University Press.
- Lam, Y.L.J. (1993). A typology of negotiated order. *National forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 10(3), 16-27.
- Lam, Y.L.J. (1994). Coping with external environmental constraints: Some managerial strategies of chief education officers. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 9(2), 22-37.
- Lam, Y.L.J. (1996a). Coping with external environmental constraints: Adaptation patterns of public school administrators. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 11(1), 68-83.
- Lam, Y.L.J. (1996b). Adapting to external environmental constraints: Classroom teachers' strategies. *McGill Journal of Education*, 31(2), 179-193.
- Leithwood, K.A., Cousins, J.B., & Smith, M.G.R. (1990). Principals' problem solving: Types of problems encountered. *Canadian School Executive*, 9(2), 11-15.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Martin, W.B.W. (1976). *The negotiated order of the school*. Toronto, ON: Macmillan.
- Muth, R. (1984). Toward an integrative theory of power in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20(2), 25-40.
- Pfeffer, J. (1970). *Organizational ecology: A systems resource approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schein, E.H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shank, R., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Singh, V., Tucker, D.J., & Meinhard, A.G. (1988). *Are voluntary associations structurally inert? Exploring an assumption in organizational ecology*. Paper presented at the 48th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Smith, M.L., & Glass, G.V. (1987). *Research and evaluation in education and the social sciences*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19.

Research Notes: Guidelines

The *Note* should report briefly on the author's/authors' research-in-progress or recently completed research and should feature work that has not been reported elsewhere in journal publications. This current work should be situated, briefly, in the context of other pertinent scholarship, including the author's or authors' related research. The focus of the *Note* could be either a specific study or inquiry or an overview of an ongoing line of inquiry where fuller reporting of results will not occur in print for some time. The maximum length for a *Note* is 1,000 words (about 4 double-spaced pages in standard 12-point type), excluding references and one or two tables or graphs. To encourage communication between researchers, authors of *Research Notes* are asked to provide contact information such as e-mail, fax, and/or telephone numbers for publication with each *Note*. No abstract is required, but in all other respects the usual **ajer** guidelines for manuscripts should be observed.

Submissions to *Research Notes* will be reviewed for readability, clarity, organization, length, and adherence to all *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* (**ajer**) guidelines. Any submission that is judged to meet these criteria will be published as soon as possible to minimize the usual delays in moving submissions to publication. Any submission that is judged to require revisions according to the criteria outlined will not be published, as the *Notes* must have some currency if they are to serve the purposes identified.

Julia Ellis
University of Alberta

Volunteer Mentorship Programs to Prevent and Respond to Troubled Behavior

Although schools are becoming increasingly concerned about serious learning-disruptive behavior and violence and are responding with various initiatives, the most commonly used approaches have not had much long-term success in reducing the incidence of these problems in youth (Mills, Dunham, & Alpert, 1988). Researchers in this area have come to recognize that what is needed in elementary schools are programs that emphasize prevention, early intervention, and enriched instruction in early elementary years (Barr & Parrett, 1995). It is also well understood that teachers working alone cannot provide for such programs. It would appear to be both beneficial and necessary to move toward a community-based response to meet students' needs. Our planned study seeks: (a) to evaluate the benefits of volunteer mentorship programs for students; and (b) to determine whether such programs influence the nature and extent of serious learning-disruptive behaviors in schools.

Students' troubled behavior has been the focus of a considerable amount of research. Many have come to recognize that whether students manifest prosocial behavior and achievement depends on how well their developmental needs have been met (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 1990; Guetzloe, 1994). Brendtro and Long (1995), long-time researchers in the area of troubled children and youth, have identified developmental needs as being those for attachment, achievement, autonomy, and altruism. In our culture we have come to expect that parents in each nuclear family will meet all the developmental needs of their own children. The troubled behavior of so many children and adolescents in schools today is a clear indication that this expectation simply is not realistic. From an historical perspective, it never was the small nuclear family that performed so many functions. Rather, extended families or tribes collectively cared for and met the needs of children.

What we are now witnessing in growth-centered efforts to prevent or remedy problem behavior are programs that enlist volunteers as mentors to extend the support base for meeting students' needs (Brendtro & Banbury, 1994; Freedman, 1993; Hoover & Juul, 1993; Schneider, 1995; Varenhorst, 1992; Vorrath & Brendtro, 1985). Programs and practices that extend support take many different forms depending on the context, students' needs, and availability of volunteers or mentors. One school might offer a breakfast club that provides a simple breakfast and an adult partner for paired reading. In a classroom three students might have adult companions who simply sit beside them while they do their work three half-days per week. In a school older students may be buddied with younger students in various ways. What is key

in these kinds of programs and practices is the opportunity for continuity of relationship with a caring volunteer. The amount of time per week may be limited or generous, but it is the continuity of the relationship that will create the opportunity for attachment and a base from which the mentor can support achievement, autonomy, and altruism.

Our communities have many people who could contribute an hour a week or more to the life of a child who is not their own. What we lack is the structural coordination and communication to facilitate manageable commitments by available volunteer mentors. The long-term goals of the proposed work are to research the kinds of mentorship programs that could be created in our communities and to learn what their effectiveness could be. With evaluation of the effectiveness of such programs a case could be made for funding coordinator positions for such programs.

The planned research that I describe here is the second stage in a program of research related to serious learning-disruptive behavior in schools. Currently in progress is the first stage, which entails the production of a video in which students share their perspectives on classroom management and on how teachers can make classrooms better places for all students. We hope that by hearing students' voices and stories on these questions, preservice teachers will develop stronger convictions about the importance of proactive measures they can take to reduce troubled behavior in their classrooms.

In the planned study we will work with elementary schools that are already using or would like to begin using growth-centered, support-extending programs or practices that engage volunteer mentors. We wish to document the experience of participants (both students and mentors) in these programs and the observations of teachers regarding change in students' prosocial behavior and achievement in school generally. From our data we hope to learn about the rhythm of each program activity. For example, a volunteer from a paired reading breakfast club described how her student partner used the time only to eat toast and peanut butter for the first four weeks, then told her about himself for the next four weeks, and after that only wanted to read with her and was not interested in toast anymore. Collecting such data on various program activities will help us understand what they accomplish and how they work. We plan to observe program activities, interview participants, and interview teachers and administrators over a six-month period.

We will write about our research for journals, books, and conferences in the usual academic manner. However, because of the long-term goals of the project we also wish to make a video documentary program that provides an overview of our research on these demonstration mentorship activities. The video could then be used to promote similar undertakings in other school communities, which would facilitate our research on such practices more extensively. The video would also be useful in preservice teacher education to enhance new teachers' awareness of valuable ways to engage volunteers to support students' prosocial growth. Because the video would provide information on the effectiveness of the practices studied, it would also be an important component of applications for corporate sponsorship to cover the costs of the

coordinator positions that are so badly needed for wider-scale and long-term use of such programs.

Our previous work with mentorship programs has been undertaken in the area of enrichment and gifted education programs. The object in these programs was to gain access to additional program resources for students such as field trips, guest speakers, special topic consultants, supervisors for specialized independent projects, and so forth. Although the purposes for mentorship programs in this proposal are somewhat different, the tasks of needs assessment, communication, and coordination are quite similar. When enrichment-oriented mentorship programs evaporated, they did so because the teachers trying to coordinate them in their "spare time" became burned out. Funding must be obtained to support coordinator positions for mentorship programs. Research on the how-to and effectiveness of demonstration projects is required in order to make the case for that funding.

Our intentions are to identify partner schools during the fall of 1996 and to study volunteer mentorship program activities for six months, January to June 1997. During summer 1997, we will complete written reports on this research and, if further funding is acquired, complete the production of a documentary video program that provides an overview of the research. Although our initial work will be in Edmonton, we plan to extend the research to sites in Calgary and Lethbridge in order also to study community-specific variables that influence volunteer mentorship program activities.

Our future work would entail securing funding for coordinators of volunteer mentor programs; the development of systems for needs assessments and communication with potential volunteers; and development of provincial and regional interagency partnerships for contributing information, ideas, resources, and systems to locally coordinated mentorship programs. At each step of these developments research would be required to determine the appropriateness as well as the short- and long-term benefits of the activities supported.

The project team includes: Julia Ellis, Susan Hart, and Jan Small-McGinley, University of Alberta; Irene MacDonald, University of Alberta/University of Calgary; Vicki Mather, A.T.A. Safe and Caring Schools Project; Nancy Grigg, University of Lethbridge; and David Jardine, University of Calgary.

References

- Barr, R.D., & Parrett, W.H. (1995). *Hope at last for at-risk youth*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brendtro, L., & Banbury, J. (1994). Tapping the strengths of oppositional youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, 3(2), 41-45.
- Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Brendtro, L., & Long, N. (1995). Breaking the cycle of conflict. *Educational Leadership*, 52(5), 52-56.
- Freedman, M. (1993). *The kindness of strangers: Adult mentors, urban youth, and the new volunteerism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guetzloe, E. (1994). Risk, resilience, and protection. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Problems*, 3(2), 2-5.
- Hoover, J., & Juul, C. (1993). Bullying in Europe and the US. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Problems*, 2(1), 25-29.
- Mills, R.C., Dunham, R.G., & Alpert, G.P. (1988). Working with high-risk youth in prevention and early intervention programs: Toward a comprehensive wellness model. *Adolescence*, 23(91), 643-660.

- Schneider, S. (1995). Young leaders mentoring troubled children. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Problems*, 4(2), 31-33.
- Varenhorst, B.B. (1992). Developing youth as resources to their peers. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Problems*, 1(3), 10-13.
- Vorrath, H., & Brentro, L. (1985). *Positive peer culture*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine du Gruyter.

*Marina Vanayan, Nicholas White,
Patricia Yuen, and Marla Teper*
Research Department, Metropolitan Separate School Board, Toronto

Would You Like to Be a Peer Mediator? Willingness to Be a Peer Mediator Among Elementary Students: Effects of Grade and Gender

The Peer Mediation/Peacemaker Pilot Project (Metropolitan Separate School Board, 1992), was recently introduced in several elementary schools in the Toronto area. It is a school-based mediation program designed to help resolve conflicts among students. Student peer mediators are trained to help "disputants" resolve disagreements by listening to both parties and by encouraging them to talk about their differences. Peer mediators are selected on the basis of student nominations that are not limited to exemplary students. New peer mediators receive a two-day training session in which they are taught effective communication and mediation techniques in an activity-based environment. Typically, students engage in mediation activities during recess or lunch, and they participate in weekly meetings moderated by a teacher to discuss their experiences and concerns (see Sorensen, 1992, pp. 83-123, for an overview of the mediation process).

As part of a formative evaluation of the Peer Mediation/Peacemaker Pilot Project, students in grades 5, 6, and 7 were asked to complete a questionnaire on their views about the program. The data reported in this article are based on the responses of students to one item on the questionnaire: "*Would you like to be a Peer Mediator?*" This question was considered critical because it was assumed that willingness to participate would be a significant determinant of program success. Specifically, we were interested in examining, first, whether students' responses to this question changed across grades (5-7) and, second, whether there were gender differences in the students' answers. Based on anecdotal evidence that we had informally gathered from teachers, we expected to find both a developmental trend and a gender difference. According to teacher reports, older students appeared to be less interested in becoming peer mediators than younger students, and girls generally appeared to be more interested than boys. Unfortunately, at a time when peer mediation programs are increasing in numbers (Lam, 1989; Robertson, 1991), empirical evidence concerning these questions, among others, has often not been forthcoming (but see Toronto Board of Education, 1995). Such information would undoubtedly be useful to program coordinators both for program planning and for making decisions about the selection of peer mediators.

Address correspondence to Marina Vanayan, Research Department, Metropolitan Separate School Board, 80 Sheppard Ave. E., Toronto/Willowdale, ON, M2N 6E8, Canada.

Table 1
Response to the Question “Would you like to be a Peer Mediator?” by Grade

Grade	Response		Total
	Yes	No	
5	41 (59%)	29 (41%)	70 (100%)
6	24 (34%)	46 (66%)	70 (100%)
7	18 (26%)	52 (74%)	70 (100%)

Method

Respondents

All students were from six Toronto schools that were in their second year of implementing the Peer Mediation Project. A total of 77 grade 5 students (35 boys and 42 girls), 72 grade 6 students (36 boys and 36 girls), and 81 grade 7 students (44 boys and 37 girls) from the six schools participated. None of the students had been peer mediators during the previous year and none were presently peer mediators. In each grade 35 boys and 35 girls were randomly selected, resulting in the total sample of 210 students.

Procedure

The question “Would you like to be a Peer Mediator?” was the eighth item in Part A of a questionnaire that was administered to students. Students were required to respond by choosing one of two alternatives, “Yes” or “No”. Other items included in this section identified the grade and gender of students.

Results

Students’ willingness to participate as peer mediators changed across grades. Although the majority of grade 5 students indicated that they *would like* to be peer mediators, the majority of students in grades 6 and 7 said that they *would not like* to be peer mediators. The total numbers and percentages of students in each grade selecting “Yes” or “No” responses are shown in Table 1. A chi-square test of independence using these totals yielded a significant result,

Table 2
Response to the Question “Would you like to be a Peer Mediator?”
by Grade and Gender

Grade	Gender					
	Yes	Boys No	Total	Yes	Girls No	Total
5	19 (54%)	16 (46%)	35 (100%)	22 (63%)	13 (37%)	35 (100%)
6	11 (31%)	24 (69%)	35 (100%)	13 (37%)	22 (63%)	35 (100%)
7	8 (23%)	27 (77%)	35 (100%)	10 (28%)	25 (72%)	35 (100%)
	38 (36%)	67 (64%)	105 (100%)	45 (43%)	60 (57%)	105 (100%)

$\chi^2(2)=17.01, p<.001$. As shown in the table, although 59% of grade 5 students indicated that they *would like* to be peer mediators, about 70% of students in grades 6 and 7 stated that they *would not like* to be peer mediators.

The second finding pertained to gender. Student gender did not significantly affect willingness to participate as a peer mediator. Across all grades, 36% of boys and 43% of girls indicated a willingness to participate. Although the percentages of girls responding “Yes” is slightly higher than boys at each grade level, these differences were not statistically significant (see Table 2) according to chi-square analyses.

Discussion

Two main findings are reported in this article. First, older students are less likely to express a willingness to be a peer mediator than younger students. Second, there seems to be no gender difference in willingness to become a peer mediator. We believe that the results reported here provide useful insight into variables that might contribute to the success of student mediation programs, although further research is clearly needed. For example, the greater interest or enthusiasm of younger children might lead program coordinators to consider extending peer mediation programs to lower grades and to initiate mediation training at a younger age. The involvement of greater numbers of willing participants might result in greater program success during the early school years and might lead to better integration of peer mediation into the school culture. As a result, older students socialized in this school culture might be more accepting of the peer mediation process; this in turn might lead to more willing participation from older students. Similarly, the finding of no significant gender difference in willingness to participate across grades might guide program coordinators in their efforts. This second result is particularly interesting because it is not consistent with earlier anecdotal observations, thus accentuating the need for further systematic research in this area.

Notes

The research reported here forms part of an evaluation of the Peer Mediation/Peacemaker Pilot Project at the Metropolitan Separate School Board in Toronto.

Opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policy of the Metropolitan Separate School Board.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to James D. Feeney, our department head, and members of the Peer Mediation Evaluation Committee for the opportunity to conduct this research.

References

- Lam, J.A. (1989). *The impact of conflict resolution programs on schools: A review and synthesis of the evidence*. Amherst, MA: National Association for Mediation in Education.
- Metropolitan Separate School Board. (1992). *Peer mediation/peacemaker teacher's manual*. Toronto, ON: Author.
- Robertson, G. (1991). *School-based peer mediation programs: A natural extension of developmental guidance programs*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education.
- Sorensen, D.L. (1992). *Conflict resolution and mediation for peer helpers*. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.

Toronto Board of Education. (1995). *An evaluation of conflict resolution programs at the secondary level at the Toronto Board of Education 1993-1994; The evolution of a model*. Toronto, ON: Research Services, Toronto Board of Education.

Book Reviews

Assessing Students in Classrooms and Schools. Robert J. Wilson. Scarborough, ON: Allyn and Bacon, 1996, 193 pages.

Reviewed by John A. Ross, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Teachers view student evaluation as a central teaching function and devote a large part of their preparation time to the creation of instruments and observation procedures, to marking and recording, and to synthesizing results in formal and informal reports. Yet teachers give themselves low proficiency ratings on evaluation tasks, a view shared by many researchers and teacher educators. Teachers often express uneasiness about the defensibility of their assessment practices, and with good reason. Robert Wilson has written an engaging text that offers practical guidance, leavened with measurement theory, for teachers who wrestle with assessment tasks. The book is organized around teaching roles that involve assessment in the classroom. Each role is addressed in a series of chapters that focus on the experiences of Kathy Strickland, an elementary teacher of modest experience and good practice, who teaches grade 8 at the beginning of the book, is seconded to a secondary school in the middle, and returns to the elementary panel at the end.

Each of the roles described by Wilson focuses on a specific purpose for assessment and affords the author the opportunity to describe workable procedures, well illustrated in the context of realistic classroom episodes. The roles addressed are teacher as mentor (procedures for observing individual students that enable teachers to individualize instruction), teacher as interactive guide (formulating questions to monitor class progress), teacher as formal guide (constructing test and exam items of various types), teacher as accountant (basic measurement concepts used to interpret student performance), teacher as reporter (integrating quantitative and qualitative measurement methods to describe student performance to parents and others), and teacher as program director (using assessment data, including standardized test scores, to modify programs).

The sequencing of topics is particularly interesting. Most texts celebrating authentic assessment assume that teachers are familiar with the basic principles of the psychometric approach. The authors elaborate the new by castigating the old, building their argument for performance appraisal on the inadequacies of a testing method that assumes that complex performances can be deconstructed and decontextualized. Wilson, wisely in my view, does not assume that teachers are crypto-psychometricians in need of liberation. Given

the explosion of articles in teachers' journals and the wealth of how-to-do-it workshops on portfolios, peer- and self-evaluation, student-led conferences, and classroom observation, Wilson begins with the new and moves to the old. Only after reviewing observation and questioning techniques for interactive decision-making does he begin to explore the classic domains of testing. He then demonstrates how quantitative measurement methods can contribute to a qualitative framework for viewing, interpreting, and reporting students' work in school.

This sequence tells us much about the intended audience. Wilson is writing for the relative novice and the preservice candidate. He speaks to this audience with particular clarity. Among the many strengths of the book is the ample use of concrete illustrations emerging from believable episodes. For example, Wilson gives an extended discussion of the common practice of aggregating in-class assignments and tests into a final grade, weighting the components so that the final examination represents only a modest proportion of the course grade. He demonstrates that the outcomes of such policies is the opposite of what is intended, that it is the contribution of each item to the total variance that matters, and he provides teachers with some workable (but taxing) strategies for adjusting the weights.

Wilson's account is strong in its attention to the links between assessment and other parts of teaching. He uses a theory of teaching, labeled Portable ICE, to govern assessment choices. ICE is a strategy for sequencing probes (consisting of determining what the key Ideas are, Connecting one set of ideas to another, and Extending beyond the information given) that can be applied with a variety of assessment methods.

Teachers who are expanding their craft knowledge to include greater use of technology will appreciate the advice that Wilson gives on how to use spreadsheets to record numerical data, word processing programs to enter and manipulate anecdotal information, and simple statistical programs to produce indicators of central tendency, variance, reliability, and validity. The discussion of how to read statistical output will be helpful to many teachers who are struggling to make sense of their data. The appendix also outlines how to accomplish similar tasks using methods that are low-tech (using a calculator) and no-tech (paper, pencil, and a large eraser).

What is a bit surprising in Wilson's discussion of technology is the lack of reference to e-mail, bulletin board systems, and Internet connections to obtain and share assessment ideas and specific instruments. Many districts are beginning to create electronic networks to promote collaboration among teachers and it is a trend to be encouraged. In the epilogue Wilson recommends that the new teacher begin by finding a mentor to guide his or her early assessment experiences. He refers on occasion to secondary departments making assessment decisions as a group. The theme of assessment as a collective enterprise of the staff, rather than a duty of isolated teachers, is a message that beginning teachers need to hear. My sense is that in many schools teachers do not talk to their peers about assessment. They are reluctant to share because they believe what they are doing is not good enough to offer to others, and they rarely ask

for help because to do so would be to confess, to themselves and others, that their assessment practices are below professional standards. By contrast, other schools, where a culture of inquiry and collective support is the norm, make student evaluation policy and practice regular agenda items. The contribution of culture building to the improvement of assessment is not prominent in Wilson's book.

Another area that could be given greater attention concerns the difficulty that new teachers (and experienced teachers given an unfamiliar teaching assignment) have in determining what level of performance is good enough. Teachers need to know what a grade 4 paragraph looks like, how it differs from a similar piece written in grade 8, and how both differ from an argument written by a senior division student in a specific disciplinary community. Wilson provides two examples of rubrics for assessing writing, but he does not tell his readers how they could produce such schemes to guide their interpretation of student performance on other important outcomes. The experienced teacher's knowledge of students' typical errors and recurring misconceptions is vital in defining the specific information that needs to be collected to monitor student progress. Teaching for understanding places a heavy burden on assessment. The dilemma is that good assessment generates knowledge about how well students are learning, but to construct useful evaluation tools we need to know in advance what that learning looks like.

Researchers will have some quarrels with Wilson's book. I would have liked more discussion of how the Principles for Fair Student Assessment in the appendix could be used by teachers. I wanted Wilson to talk about how teachers might assess students who are working in groups, advising teachers how to disentangle individual from group performance. I liked the many suggestions for helping students self-evaluate but I wished he had described how teachers could involve students in setting the criteria used to appraise their work. But these are the usual criticisms of a reviewer who wants more air time for whatever set of issues he or she is thinking about at the particular moment of reading the book.

The coverage of topics is surprisingly broad and deep given the length of the book. It is highly accessible to teachers, much more readable than its competitors, and teachers who follow the advice that Wilson offers will not stray far from the ideals of the assessment revolution. I highly recommend the book for use in preservice programs and inservice sessions because it sets the agenda so clearly, identifies the most credible options, illustrates them well, and provides sensible guidance for using assessment to accomplish a broad range of teachers' duties.

The Changing University? Tom Schuller (Editor). Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 1995, 184 pages.

Reviewed by Don Chapman, University College of the Fraser Valley

In reviewing this book, I feel compelled to begin on a more personal note than might usually be the case. I am a faculty member in a degree program in one of Canada's hybrid institutions of higher education, called a University College. My home institution gained degree-granting status within the past five years, and the program within which I operate was one of the institution's first undergraduate initiatives after degree granting status was conferred. This particular degree program is oriented generally toward learners who are approaching a first degree at about mid-life and in mid-career. Many of the policies under which our degree program operates do press the boundaries of university convention, particularly with regard to matters of access, credit for prior learning, and the manner in which students meet program requirements. In my professional life, then, perhaps I live on the cusp of the question that serves as the title of the book upon which I am about to comment. This does not necessarily make me an expert on the subject in any conventional sense, but I do come to the review of this book with a keen intellectual, as well as a pragmatic, interest in the topic.

Turning to the book, then, editor Tom Schuller, of the Centre for Continuing Education at the University of Edinburgh, introduces this collection by drawing our attention to the question mark in the title. He indicates that the question mark acts as a challenge to the book's contributors, as well as to the readers, to consider whether *The University* (my emphasis) actually is changing, and if so how. The editor acknowledges that the primary context for the book is the United Kingdom.

This 1995 publication of the British Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press reportedly represents the proceedings of a conference to which 14 participants were asked to contribute papers. The contributors represent an array that includes a varied and rich range of backgrounds in higher education. Apparently the contributors were asked to consider, in a descriptive way, the nature of change being experienced by *The University*. Notwithstanding the focus on the United Kingdom, contributors included a number of individuals with international experiences, and specifically, a minority of the contributors is from Australia, Canada, and the United States. Many of the contributors are administrators or have some administrative responsibility for the operation of institutions of higher education. Some would appear to be primarily scholars interested in the topic. Contributions are presented in the form of chapters, and one suspects that in some cases contributors were asked to address particular aspects of the matter under examina-

Don Chapman is a faculty member and program head of the adult education, undergraduate degree program.

tion. Chapter headings deal with subjects such as "Changing Leadership in Universities," "From Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise," "Future Patterns of Teaching and Learning," "Funding a Changing System," "Less Control and More Vocationalism: The Australian and New Zealand Experience," and more.

Typical of most published conference proceedings, this book represents the text-based equivalent of a collage—at best, a loosely arranged collection of diverse images, set out in an insightful way around a central notion; at worst, a rather haphazard arrangement of images to which the viewer attempts desperately to attach meaning or relevance. In the case of this book, the editor makes a valiant effort—in his words, through "editorial induction"—to have this publication serve the former role rather than the latter. In my judgment it is a stretch.

The whole notion of *The University*, and the change to which *it* is subject, presents—perhaps unintentionally—a conundrum for the thoughtful reader. The very title of the book seems to presume the existence of a singular and somewhat universal educational enterprise—*The University*. The assumption seems to be that each of these writers is offering a perspective on the same entity, but with some acknowledgment of shifts in geography and mandate.

In my opinion, the collected essays in this book throw serious doubt on this implied notion. Yet the contributors, including the editor, pay scant attention to how this collection calls the notion into question. If I as reader came away from this book with any predominant impression of the university (changing or otherwise), it would be a sense that I had been taken on a tour, mostly by people who see the university primarily in terms of management or administrative matters such as policies, enrollments, budgets, staffing, funding agencies, processes, and the like. As such, this book may well appeal to a reader with inclinations toward, or interests in, such a viewpoint. The various contributors, however, speak of these features in the contexts of particular circumstances and settings, which range from the United Kingdom, to Canada and the United States, to Latin America and Africa, to Australia and New Zealand. Hence, to a great extent, one is presented with what amounts to a series of administratively oriented, unevenly developed case studies. Perhaps it is at the level of administrative tasks that the higher education world looks most homogeneous; and to the extent that this book is focused on such matters, the legend of *The University* can be sustained.

In the opening chapter, the editor scrambles to build a template—a sketch map he calls it—to try to bring together some sense of pattern from the disparate offerings. My own sense is that the areas of pattern—and in fairness, many are present in the submissions—have more to do with categories particular to an administrative viewpoint than they do with any fundamental notion of the nature of university or of the way the fundamental nature may be changing. For example, several of the case-like submissions deal with matters such as the changing profile of the students—but students as numerical trends or articulation problems. Little is said of the experience of being a learner in these settings called university. Or another pattern that receives some attention

is the institutional response to economic restraint. Themes such as these will not surprise most of us. But, as I say, such thematic elements seem to be considered primarily as if administrators and administrative problems cast in administrative terms are *The University*.

The book comes closest to attending to what I would call the fundamental idea of university and changes in that idea in the two-page closing chapter, "The Social and Political Vocation of the University in the Global Age," by Radim Palous. One wonders if the book might have been a more insightful document had Palous' brief foray into "the changing idea of university" been an organizing keynote around which all the other conference participants had organized their own contributions.

From an intellectual point of view, I was disappointed that few if any of the contributions to the book seemed to challenge me to think deeply about university as an idea, an idea with a history, and an idea that may be under assault or at least in transition. I found myself reading about symptoms, but not understanding much about the patient. To be fair, some authors make reference to the press toward vocationalism or make reference to a phrase that must be common currency in the lexicon of the United Kingdom: the *binary divide*. I can only assume that the binary divide may be partly descriptive of places similar to my own home institution, where two powerful ideas collide: the powerful idea of community college, and an older, but equally powerful, idea of university.

In my own setting, sometimes this divide is a seething inferno, a place where new notions are in formation and existing values are challenged. One finds oneself rethinking ideas such as scholarship, education, teaching, learning, and the roles that one plays in relation to these. Unfortunately, few of the authors in this compilation seemed willing to plumb these matters. In the end I found myself unsatisfied in meeting the two key agendas I had as a reader: to understand more deeply the notion of university and change, in a scholarly sense, and/or to feel informed and guided as a participant (but not necessarily as an administrator) in my own setting.



University of Alberta
Edmonton

Alberta Journal of Educational Research

Canada T6G 2G5

845 Education Centre South, Telephone (403) 492-3751
Fax (403) 492-0236

Order Form

- ☐ Please begin my ☐ one-year ☐ two-year subscription
with the current volume

OR the 19____ volume at the following subscription rate:

- ☐ Individual \$37 per year ☐ Institutional \$45 per year

Subscription price \$ _____

Canadian residents add 7% GST;

For orders outside Canada add \$8.00 postage \$ _____

Total \$ _____

- ☐ Please send me the following theme issue(s) at \$20.00 per copy
(price includes postage and handling) # of Copies

☐ Canadian Perspectives on *The Bell Curve*
Vol XLI(3), 1995 _____ \$ _____

☐ Education and Development: Past Lessons,
Present Crises, Future Possibilities, Vol XLII(2), 1996 _____ \$ _____

☐ Secondary Schools and the Canadian Mosaic:
The Exemplary Schools Project, Vol XLII(3), 1996 _____ \$ _____

Subtotal \$ _____

Canadian residents add 7% GST \$ _____

Total \$ _____

- ☐ Please send me the following back issue(s) at \$12.00 per copy
(price includes postage and handling)

Year _____ Volume _____ No. _____

Year _____ Volume _____ No. _____

Subtotal \$ _____

Canadian residents add 7% GST \$ _____

Total \$ _____

Method of Payment

- ☐ I enclose a cheque/money order payable to
The Alberta Journal of Educational Research

- ☐ Please charge my Visa card no. _____

Expiry Date _____ Signature _____

- ☐ Please invoice me

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Province/State _____

Country _____ Postal Code _____

Telephone _____ Fax _____

Please mail this form to the address shown above.

Contents

<i>Beth Young</i>	1	From the Editor's Desk
<i>Articles</i>		
<i>Allison Tom</i>	3	The Deliberate Relationship: A Frame for Talking About Faculty-Student Relationships
<i>Anne E. Elliott</i> <i>Vera E. Woloshyn</i>	23	Some Female Professors' Experiences of Collaboration: Mapping the Collaborative Process Through Rough Terrain
<i>Y.L. Jack Lam</i>	37	Loose-Coupled Responses to External Constraints: An Analysis of Public Educators' Coping Strategies
<i>Research Notes</i>	51	Editor's Note
<i>Julia Ellis</i>	53	Volunteer Mentorship Programs to Prevent and Respond to Troubled Behavior
<i>Marina Vanayan</i> <i>Nicholas White</i> <i>Patricia Yuen</i> <i>Marla Teper</i>	57	Would You Like to Be a Peer Mediator? Willingness to Be a Peer Mediator Among Elementary Students: Effects of Grade and Gender
<i>Book Reviews</i>		
<i>John A. Ross</i>	61	<i>Assessing Students in Classrooms and Schools</i> by Robert J. Wilson.
<i>Don Chapman</i>	64	<i>The Changing University?</i> edited by Tom Schuller

If undelivered return to:

The Alberta Journal of Educational Research
845 Education Centre South
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB
T6G 2G5

Publications Mail Registration Number 1438